

RL.

Royal Commission on Local Government  
in England

---

RESEARCH STUDIES  
9

*Community Attitudes Survey: England*

---

LONDON  
HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE  
PRICE 17s. 6d. NET



## FOREWORD

The views expressed in the research studies are solely the responsibility of the authors, not of the Royal Commission.

*Royal Commission on Local Government in England  
February 1969.*



# CONTENTS

		<i>Page</i>
FOREWORD . . . . .		iii
INTRODUCTION . . . . .		1
SUMMARY . . . . .		3
SECTION A	Perception of the Community Area . . . . .	11
	Introduction . . . . .	11
	1. Existence and Extent . . . . .	11
	2. Nature . . . . .	17
	Summary . . . . .	24
SECTION B	Community Involvement . . . . .	25
	Introduction . . . . .	25
	1. Attitudinal Indices . . . . .	25
	2. Behavioural Characteristics . . . . .	32
	(a) Residence . . . . .	32
	(b) Patterns of Kinship and Social Acquaintance . . . . .	41
	(c) Employment . . . . .	48
	(d) Leisure and Other Activities . . . . .	51
	(e) Readership of Local Newspapers . . . . .	65
	(f) Schooling . . . . .	68
	(g) Shopping . . . . .	70
	(h) Participation in Local Government and Local Public Service . . . . .	73
	(i) Rates Payment . . . . .	77
	(j) Summary of Activities . . . . .	78
	Summary . . . . .	80
SECTION C	Knowledge of, and Attitudes towards, Local Government Services . . . . .	83
	Introduction . . . . .	83
	1. Knowledge . . . . .	83
	2. Attitudes towards the Local Provision of Public Services . . . . .	87
	Summary . . . . .	96
SECTION D	Accessibility to Local Government Offices, Officials and Representatives . . . . .	97
	Introduction . . . . .	97
	1. Hypothesised Approaches to Various Offices and Officials . . . . .	97
	2. Experience of Accessibility . . . . .	109
	3. Knowledge of Town Hall and County Hall location; and Attitudes towards Accessibility to these . . . . .	115
	Accessibility and Efficiency . . . . .	123
	Summary . . . . .	124



<b>SECTION E</b>	<b>Attitudes towards the size of Local Authority Areas</b>	127
	Introduction	127
	1. Extent, nature and strength of opinion	127
	2. The nature of attitudes towards size	130
	Summary	135
<b>SECTION F</b>	<b>Attitudes towards Representation</b>	137
	Introduction	137
	1. Optimum size of area of representation	137
	2. Residence of local councillor	141
	Summary	142
<b>SECTION G</b>	<b>Factor analysis of community involvement, and conclusions</b>	143
	Introduction	143
	1. Factor analysis of community involvement	143
	2. Some conclusions from the enquiry	162
	Summary	165
<b>APPENDIX A</b>	<b>Definitions used in this report</b>	167
<b>APPENDIX B</b>	<b>Technical details</b>	169
<b>APPENDIX C</b>	<b>Report on preliminary qualitative studies</b>	175
<b>APPENDIX D</b>	<b>Some notes on procedure in the factor analysis</b>	182



## INTRODUCTION

WE present a report on an enquiry carried out for the Government Social Survey on behalf of the Royal Commission on Local Government in England.\* It is intended that the findings contained in this document should comprise a set of data which may be used by the Commission, alongside and in conjunction with those from other studies.

### Purposes of the Survey

Four main themes, or areas of study, underlay this enquiry:

The nature of community life, as shown in an investigation of leisure activities, family relationships and patterns of acquaintance, shopping habits, employment, and so on;

The geographical size of community areas, particularly in relation to the existing boundaries of local authority areas;

Knowledge of, and attitudes towards, the administration of local government services; and

The degree of accessibility which exists, or is thought to exist, for people to their elected representatives, officials and miscellaneous departments in local government service.

Other secondary areas of concern are itemised within the separate chapters of this report.

### Summary of the Survey Method

A full exposition of technical procedures used in the conduct of this enquiry is appended to this report (Appendix B). We need only comment here that the survey has been based upon a sample of 2,199 electors selected from 100 local authority areas throughout England (excluding London) in numbers correctly proportionate to the population which is contained within three main types of local authority of different population sizes within the Registrar General's Standard Regions. Thus, a fully representative sample of electors has been recruited, according to these three factors.

In addition, a further 143 interviews were carried out with electors living in six municipal boroughs or urban districts of 60,000–100,000 population. In proportional terms, this type of authority constitutes a small but nevertheless important category, and greater representation was necessitated to allow for statistically respectable analysis of the activities and opinions of electors resident within it. A note is made in the report wherever analyses have included this supplementary sample; no reweighting of the total sample has therefore been necessary.

The questionnaire used in the enquiry incorporated certain questions derived from the "Local Government Elector" Survey (carried out by the Government Social Survey for the Committee on the Management of Local Government); it also benefited from suggestions arising from special preliminary work† carried out by Research Services Limited. The questionnaire was the subject of a pilot

---

\* The Commission's terms of reference are:

To consider the structure of local government in England, outside Greater London, in relation to its existing functions; and to make recommendations for authorities and boundaries, and for functions and their division, having regard to the size and character of areas in which these can be most effectively exercised and the need to sustain a viable system of local democracy.

† A commentary on this earlier work is included in this report as Appendix C.



survey of 55 interviews carried out in March 1967, and the main stage of fieldwork, conducted by interviewers of the Social Survey, lasted from April 24th to July 13th. (This included recalls on 150 informants who had earlier been non-productive.) Briefing of interviewers took place in London immediately prior to the commencement of fieldwork. The final response rate on the survey was 77%.

Appendix A to this report contains definitions of some terms and symbols used in the commentary and tables.

In the presentation of data from this survey we have selected for commentary those results which appear to reveal recognisable variations or trends, according to the particular factor or break-down concerned. In addition analyses of the main areas of information in the survey in terms of what we may call "standard" breakdowns have been incorporated for reference purposes. These additional analyses are:

- type and size of local authority area,
- size of the perceived "home" area,
- socio-economic status of the informant, and
- education of the informant.

May, 1968.

Research Services Ltd.



## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

### Section A

1. Nearly four in five electors claim to possess some feelings of attachment to a "home" community area. Propensity to have such a feeling is positively correlated with length of residence in the area.

2. The community area, as defined by electors, is not geographically extensive. In the majority of cases, it is considerably smaller than the size of the local authority areas in which electors reside. In urban authority areas, approximately three-quarters of electors define their "home" area as being of a size no larger than the equivalent of a ward; of these, the majority define its extent as being approximately the size of a group of streets or smaller. In rural areas, 85% of electors define the "home" area as being of a size equivalent to a parish or smaller.

3. Informants living closer to the centre of their respective authority area and those living in smaller urban local authorities are considerably more likely than others to conceptualise their "home" area as comprising the *whole* of that local authority area.

4. With increasing density of population, there is a tendency towards a narrower delineation of the "home" area, suggesting "pocket" communities distributed throughout urban settlements.

5. The higher the educational attainment of the elector, the wider is his/her conceptualisation of the "home" area. Since educational attainment is correlated with socio-economic status, a similar tendency to association is apparent between higher status and a more widely defined "home" area.

6. In distinguishing the "home" community area from surrounding areas, informants on the whole have considerations of physical appearance uppermost in their minds. Mental distinctions in human terms are less evident, but when they are made, are generally expressed in terms either of the sociability or status/prestige of the two groups of people concerned.

### Section B

1. Just over four in ten informants (41%) would be "very sorry" to leave the "home" area which they define, and a further 24% "quite sorry" to do so. Proclivity to reply in this way is greater among elderly informants and those resident longest in the area (over 20 years)—these two factors themselves being related.

2. The degree of interest in what goes on in the "home" area is greater particularly among informants of a higher socio-economic status.

3. As length of residence in the "home" area seems to promote attachment and belonging to that area, we should note that 62% of our informants have in fact lived in the defined "home" area for more than 10 years, and 44% of them for more than 20 years. Some two-thirds of the total sample had either lived in the "home" area for the whole of their lives or had moved to it from no more than 10 miles away. The greater mobility of the more highly educated is shown in the much shorter average length of residence of this group compared with electors of a lower educational attainment.

4. The main reasons given for migration to the area are connected with accommodation and employment, the latter reason assuming far more importance among informants in higher socio-economic grades.

5. The factors of kinship and acquaintance appear to be very potent aspects of community structure; more so than the pattern of general leisure activities.



Around two-thirds of our informants regard themselves as acquainted with a reasonably large number of people in their respective "home" areas. Length of residence in the area affects positively the number of people whom informants claim to know.

We may conclude that friendship exhibits a much more limited spread, geographically-speaking, than does relationship. Just over a half of all informants have adult relatives and/or in-laws living within ten minutes' walk of their home. Eighty per cent of them have friends living within the same distance, while over a third of the sample possess more than ten friends within this short span. Informants in lower socio-economic grades have more closely clustered patterns of relationship and friendship, as have those with a lower level of education.

6. Approximately four in ten of all informants are employed within their own local authority area; this represents 66% of all employed persons. Given the somewhat smaller average size of the "home" area (compared with the local authority area), we also find a smaller proportion of the total sample, 20%, is employed within the "home" area, (33% of all employed persons). Since some also usually travel outside the area in the course of their work, only 14% of all electors may be said to be employed *entirely* within their "home" area. This figure was considerably higher, however, for female employees, and informants in socio-economic groups 3 and 5, intermediate non-manual workers and semi- and unskilled workers. (Group 3 is in fact made up predominantly of females.)

7. We studied a range of different leisure and other social activities in which persons may participate within or outside their community area.

Of the activities which we studied, those which are most often pursued in the "home" area (by electors who do participate in them in the first place) and which most appropriately characterise the sorts of social activities of a "home" area as it has been defined, are:

- attendance at a place of worship (66% of "participants" usually attend in their "home" area),
- visiting a local public-house (65%),
- (children's) attendance at school (61%),
- belonging to at least one club or organisation (58%),
- visiting a public tennis court (56%),
- making the main weekly household shopping journey (47%),
- going to bingo sessions (46%),
- visiting a public park or garden (41%),
- and undertaking employment (33%).

The extent to which this range of activities is carried out within the local authority area may be illustrated by the following summary, showing the proportion of "participants" in each instance:

- 80% belong to at least one club or organisation in the local authority area,
- 53% usually visit a cinema in the local authority area,
- 32% theatre, concerts or recitals,
- 61% football, rugby or cricket matches,
- 34% a greyhound racetrack,
- 73% bingo sessions,
- 35% ten-pin bowling,



- 53% a public dance-hall,
- 53% a swimming pool,
- 53% a golf-course,
- 73% a public tennis-court,
- 70% a public park or garden,
- 23% for trips into the countryside,
- 89% attend a place of worship in the local authority area,
- 83% visit a "local" public-house in the local authority area,
- 86% have children attending school in the local authority area,
- 75% undertake the main weekly shopping journey in the local authority area.

With only one or two specific exceptions, we can not conclude that the "home" area coincides in any significant way with the pursuit of public entertainment and recreational activities. Given the relatively small size of the "home" area as defined and the need rationally to site the facilities for many of these activities in locations of optimum access to a wider population, this may not be very surprising.

8. Well over half the sample either own a motor vehicle or have one available for their use.

9. Twenty-eight per cent of all informants have full access to a private telephone in their homes.

10. Eighty-seven per cent of the sample read at least one local newspaper, most frequently an evening or weekly journal.

11. Six per cent of the sample may be defined as interested in elective participation in local government. Roughly four-fifths of these have been interested in respect of the Council of their present local authority area. The figure of 6% is considerably exceeded by men (9.5%), informants in the two highest socio-economic grades (25 and 14% respectively), those with higher or secondary levels of education (10 and 12.5%), and residents in rural districts (10%).

12. Some 9% of electors claim to have held a position or committee membership in public service of a local nature, and 5% within the defined boundary of their "home" area. Once again, those with a higher level of education were most frequently involved in this sort of local activity—over a quarter of this group claimed to participate in public service.

## Section C

1. Knowledge of the responsibilities for the local provision of public services is found to be slightly greater than average among men, younger and middle-aged informants (compared with those over 55), electors of a higher level of education and higher socio-economic status.

2. Generally speaking, there appears to be a slightly wider correct knowledge as to the authorities responsible for the administration of local government-provided services. There is some confusion as to the bodies responsible for hospitals and electricity supply, though less for social security.

3. Electors are, on balance, more disposed to mention public services in a favourable than a critical manner: 73% are able to quote at least one public service which they consider quite well run in their local authority area; 51% are also able conversely to think of at least one with which they can find fault.



4. There is some indication that the level of dissatisfaction with public services is higher among informants living in conurbation authorities, particularly municipal boroughs and urban districts.

5. The services most frequently singled out for praise are refuse collection and disposal, education and schools, libraries and hospitals. All these are mentioned by approximately 3 in 10 of the electors interviewed.

6. The services of which criticism is most often expressed (though by only approximately 1 in 10 electors) are, once again, refuse collection and hospitals, in addition to recreational facilities, town planning and provision of housing.

7. It is possible that refuse collection, hospitals and recreational facilities are services over the administration of which electors are more sensitive. We might hypothesise that they have come to be seen as yardsticks for assessing the efficiency of local provision of public services, irrespective of the authority responsible in each case.

8. There is little conclusive evidence from the results of these questions to suggest that electors care whether public services should be the responsibility of local authorities or of other, central bodies.

## Section D

1. The most frequent *primary* source which informants would consider contacting in order to deal with any enquiries or complaints is an administrative one—rather than an elected representative. The most frequently quoted source is a somewhat vague one—the “council”, or “the town hall”—but the specific council department or head of department concerned with their enquiry often features in replies also.

2. Informants in rural districts, and those of a lower level of education and socio-economic status are more likely than others to think of contacting an elected representative—usually a local councillor.

3. Should primary contact with an office or department be unsatisfactory or inconclusive then a quarter of the electors would take no further action; of the remainder the majority would consider approaching some specific *person*: the head of the relevant department or, more likely, the elector's Member of Parliament or local councillor. It may be concluded in fact that while departments and officials are seen as the main primary point of contact for electors, elected representatives are then perceived as a second resort when a first approach has proved unsatisfactory.

4. More than one in four electors would not consider contacting their local councillor at all. The three main reasons for this were said to be his incompetence, the greater suitability of contacting someone else, and lack of knowledge as to who the local councillor actually is, or how to get in touch with him.

5. Electors who *did* want to contact their councillor would think of contacting him either at his home or at the town hall or main council offices. Electors in rural districts are more likely to contact him at his home, as are those who have lived longer in the area, or are of a higher educational standard. Thirty-six per cent of the total sample claim to know where (one of) their respective local councillors live.

6. Only one in ten informants would not consider contacting a department official at all over specific problems or enquiries.

7. Just less than a quarter of the sample has ever experienced a need to contact local offices, officials or representatives over enquiries or complaints concerned



with local government services. These electors are more frequently in higher socio-economic grades, of a higher level of education, live closer to the town hall, and have a greater knowledge of local government.

8. In the greater majority of these cases, informants have made personal contact with an official or a department; the proportions of people who have contacted a council department or official, or a local councillor, are not incompatible with the figures relating to the conceived first choice of contact.

9. Fifty per cent of all enquiries and complaints are considered to have been dealt with both fully and satisfactorily. Matters relating to refuse collection, health, and drainage are considered to have been dealt with most satisfactorily; those relating to education are considered to have resulted less frequently in a satisfactory outcome.

10. Thirteen per cent of electors say they have at some time contacted their local councillor(s). While the subjects of contact were, for the most part, miscellaneous complaints and grievances, the three main public services involved were provision of housing, town planning (i.e. planning permission), and streets and highways.

11. Eighty-five per cent of the sample know correctly the location of their respective town hall, or main local authority offices. Electors in rural districts are considerably less aware of the precise location than are urban residents. Distance of residence from the main office is seen to affect adversely both the level of correct awareness of the latter site, and the propensity to visit (as measured by the number of visits made in the last year). Overall, no more than 37% of electors have visited their respective town hall/main office during the previous year.

12. Over a quarter of our informants feel that their town hall is a "very" or "quite" long way from their home; this proportion is somewhat larger among county borough and rural district residents, and understandably increases with longer distance of residence from this site.

13. Of those informants expressing an opinion (only four in ten electors), as to the optimum position of the town hall, *vis-à-vis* their homes, the majority would prefer it to be fairly near (rather than further away); in fact the nearer electors live to the town hall at present, the more likely they are to think it *should* be near.

14. Electors who would prefer the town hall to be nearer feel that proximity makes for greater *personal* accessibility. This is felt to be more desirable than other forms of contact.

15. Electors' knowledge of their respective county hall (excluding electors living in county boroughs) is much less precise. Only 52% are able correctly to indicate its location. Rural district electors are very slightly more aware of the location of the county hall than are those living in the small urban authority areas.

16. Over two-thirds of these electors consider their county hall quite a long way or a very long way from their homes. A stronger feeling of proximity to the county hall is visible among electors in rural districts than is shown by urban residents.

17. We have concluded that the best estimate as to the proportion of the total sample which values accessibility fairly highly is around 45%. We have also concluded that approximately 20-25% value efficiency quite highly.

## Section E

1. Electors' opinions as to the optimum size of their local authority areas show a very marked preference for preserving the *status quo*.

2. The reasons given for keeping the present size are a mixture of satisfaction with the present system, and apprehension in the face of the consequences of any change. The latter comprises disbelief that change in the size of the area would lead to any functional, administrative or financial (i.e. rating) improvements, and fears that an *increased* size might have adverse effects upon community interests and, specifically, the surrounding countryside.

3. Reasons advanced in support of both an increase and a decrease in local authority area size are concerned very largely with the material gains which would accrue to the present area (or the electors' own part of it) from either sort of change.

4. Among those favouring a change, the balance of general opinion is clearly in support of a bigger authority area. Expansion is seen by those in favour of such a change as promoting greater efficiency and improving the facilities (especially in respect of housing) of the present area.

5. However, taking into consideration the views of all informants with fairly strongly-held opinions (irrespective of their basic attitude on this question), there is a slight balance of feeling that a smaller area would lead to improved accessibility and effectiveness. Many informants nevertheless consider that changes in the size of the authority area would have no consequences for either of these factors, nor for efficiency.

6. Nearly a half of the sample consider that an increase in the size of their present authority area would have no effect upon the degree of co-operation or rivalry between that area and the surrounding ones.

7. When directly considering any effects of expansion on life in their community informants are more conscious of the physical, material and functional consequences which might result, though over a half of all electors have no opinion or consider expansion would have no effects upon the community.

## Section F

1. The majority of electors favours the present size of the area of representation, i.e. an area the size of a ward or parish. Among the remaining electors a smaller area of representation than this is more popular than a larger one.

2. There is little conscious correlation between informants' conceived "home" area and the area they choose as most appropriate for the purpose of representation in local government. The reasons given for choosing the size of the area of representation are largely concerned with limitations upon the individual councillor's "work-load" and considerations of the amount of work/number of constituents he can effectively represent.

3. Nearly two-thirds of the electors think their local councillor ought to live locally. Nearly all the remaining electors do not mind if their councillor is not a local resident.

## Section G

1. Three factors were derived from the analysis, each describing different types of community involvement. These were:

- (i) "Social Attachment"—related to patterns of kinship, extended relationship and acquaintance in the "home" area;
- (ii) "Interest in Local Affairs"—concerned with variables measuring active interest in local government and local public service, interest in the events of the "home" area, and number of friends in the area;



- (iii) "Employment/Conviviality"—comprising two main variables only, employment in the "home" area and visiting a local public house in the area.

Further analyses were carried out using the first two of these factors only.

2. Relatively few informants were found to be highly involved on either scale. Their number no more than approximately one in ten of the total sample.

3. The person who is most highly involved with his community area in a way described by the Social Attachment factor is more likely to be:

- male,
- very young (i.e. 21–34 years),
- of a lower level of education,
- of a lower socio-economic status, and
- resident closer to the centre of the local authority area.

The highly-involved informant on the scale relating to Interest in Local Affairs is also more likely to be male, but otherwise—when compared with the profile of the entire sample—leans towards a different description:

- elderly,
- of a higher or secondary level of education,
- employed, either full- or part-time (rather than non-working), and
- of a higher socio-economic status.

4. The degree of involvement in terms of Interest in Local Affairs is higher among residents in rural districts, and markedly so in areas of greatest rurality (i.e. lowest density). The highest degree of Social Attachment is found among electors in the smallest urban authorities, those of less than 30,000 population.

5. In terms of certain key issues which were comprised within the survey, the main items upon which informants with a high degree of Social Attachment diverge from the remainder of the sample may be summarised as follows:

- (i) they conceptualise a "home" (community) area of a generally larger size;
- (ii) when considering whom they would contact in order to resolve enquiries or complaints over local government services, they are somewhat less likely to think of getting in touch with any office or official, and rather more likely to think in terms of an elected representative, especially (as a primary step) a local councillor.

6. Informants with a high degree of involvement on the factor termed Interest in Local Affairs, show expectedly a wider range of divergence from the rest of the sample, particularly in respect of their opinions on some issues relating to local government. The main items over which they show a different pattern of response are:

- (i) they too conceptualise a "home" area of a larger size;
- (ii) they possess a slightly greater knowledge of the responsibility for the provision of local public services;
- (iii) a larger proportion of them are able to mention local public services which are, in their opinion, quite well or not so well run.

## SECTION A

### PERCEPTION OF THE COMMUNITY AREA

#### Introduction

In this section we investigate whether people are able to conceptualise a "home" (or community) area in which they live; what is the physical size of that area; and what perceptions people have of it in relation to and comparison with surrounding and adjacent areas.

#### 1. Existence and Extent

Two of the main aims of this present survey were to investigate how far people feel that there exists a community area to which they belong and where they may feel "at home, and what physical size would best describe that area. Bearing in mind the essentially practical purpose which underlay our study—that of relating any such findings to the present (and any possible future) boundaries and divisions of local government authorities—we were concerned to employ a technical approach which would produce data in a form strictly relevant to this purpose. Thus, we were not concerned with "community" in any sense of that concept other than a physical/geographical one. We were further concerned to limit our study to the nature of a "home community" area, that is, one which should contain the informant's home address; we did not aim to study informants' perceptions of areas to which they might feel a sense of belonging, a community affiliation, but in which they were not actually resident. Thirdly, we wished to record and analyse the data on the physical extent of the home area in terms comparable to local government divisions: counties/regions; local authority areas; wards/parishes; polling districts.

Briefly, the method we adopted to obtain such data was a comprehensive and sometimes lengthy probing of the informant's verbal description of the area, using place and street names for identification as they were volunteered by the elector. Detailed maps were then employed by the interviewer—or in cases of doubt, by office-based staff—to ascertain the most appropriate size of local government unit which would be equivalent to the area described.

##### (i) *Ability to conceptualise a "home" area*

As the result of preliminary pilot research, we employed the following question (Q.2) in order to ascertain whether informants could conceptualise a community area to which they belonged:

"Is there an area round here, where you are now living, which you would say you belong to, and where you feel 'at home'?"

In total, nearly four in five of our sample were able to reply in the affirmative to this question:

TABLE 1 (Q.2)  
Ability to conceptualise a "home" area, by type of local authority

(Base)	All informants 2199	Type of local authority		
		C.B. 751	M.B./U.D. 910	R.D. 358
	%	%	%	%
With "home" area	78	76	80	76
Without "home" area*	22	24	20	24

\* Five informants did not answer this question.



Table 1 also shows that there is no very evident variation by type of local authority; (we would not perhaps expect there to be a *direct* link between these two factors). Neither is there a strong variation between informants resident in authority areas of different population sizes, though the ability to conceptualise a "home" area is very slightly more prevalent in the smaller (and perhaps more discrete) urban settlements. (See Table 2).

As Table 2 shows, however, this is by no means a consistent tendency, nor even a highly significant one; it is not continued among informants living in the very large urban settlements (irrespective of authority type), and we would not overdraw the point.

TABLE 2 (Q.2)  
Ability to conceptualise a "home" area, by size of urban local authority

(Base)	C.B.			M.B./U.D.			
	Conurbation 294	250,000+ 206	60,000- 250,000 251	Conurbation 113	60,000- 100,000 235*	30,000- 60,000 288	Up to 30,000 417
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
With a "home" area	77	78	75	79	70	80	82
Without a "home" area	23	21	25	21	30	20	18

\* Including supplementary sample.

We find that there is a slight correlation between increasing age and the likelihood of feeling a sense of belonging to a "home" area; there is no doubt, however, that this is a reflection of length of residence in the area, which shows a much more evident correlation:

TABLE 3 (Q.2)  
Ability to conceptualise a "home" area, by length of residence in the area

(Base)	Length of residence				
	Up to 3 years 336	Over 3, to 10 years 491	Over 10, to 20 years 435	Over 20 years 573	Born here 364
	%	%	%	%	%
With a "home" area	67	68	73	86	94

The sense of belonging to an area is clearly promoted not only by length of residence, but by the qualitative attachment deriving from the very fact of birth in the district.

The factor of population stability within the ward or parish in which we were interviewing appears, perhaps surprisingly, to have only a marginal and not entirely consistent relationship with the ability to conceive of a "home" area. Curiously, however, whilst in urban areas the proportion which could conceptualise a "home" area is highest in wards of greatest population growth, the opposite is the case in rural areas where the tendency to have a "home" area is greatest in parishes of greatest decline in their population size.

We present in Table 4 further analyses of answers to Question 2:

TABLE 4 (Q.2)

Ability to conceptualise a "home" area, by socio-economic status and education

(Base)	Socio-economic status						Education		
	Group*					Never employed/ others 153	Higher 129	Secondary 448	Lower 1622
	1 97	2 168	3 773	4 477	5 531				
With a "home" area	80	79	75	83	77	80	81	72	79
Without a "home" area	20	21	25	17	23	20	19	28	21

\* For an explanation and definition of these groups, see Appendix A.

(ii) Perceived size of the "home" area

In our analysis of replies to the series of questions aimed at eliciting these data, we have distinguished between those informants who think of themselves as "belonging" to the area and those who do not. Since the former group are in a substantial majority, and since their views are by definition of more relevance, our comments below tend to concentrate more upon this sub-group within the sample.

Table 5 shows how we have bracketed responses in terms of areas which, though not necessarily of similar size geographically or demographically, are approximately equivalent in terms of local authority divisions. The sequence in the table lists these areas in decreasing size.

TABLE 5 (Q.3a-3e)

Size of "home" area

With/without "home area" (Base)	Urban interviews (C.B./M.B./U.D.)			Rural interviews (R.D.)		
	Total 1661*	Yes 1303	No 355	Total 538†	Yes 407	No 129
County/region	1	*	1	2	2	1
{ Part of County (larger than rural district)	7	7	5	7	7	5
{ Town/city (local authority area) plus surrounding area	2	3	1	2	3	2
{ Rural district alone	18	19	11	2	3	—
{ Town/city (local authority area) alone	1	1	1	2	2	1
{ Part of rural district plus extra area	1	1	1	2	2	1
{ Part of town/city plus extra area	1	1	1	2	2	1
{ Part of rural district—area larger than a parish	1	1	1	2	2	1
{ Part of town/city—district larger than a ward	1	1	1	2	2	1
{ Part of rural district—parish equivalent	30	31	29	44	44	44
{ Part of town/city—ward equivalent	30	31	29	41	38	48
{ Part of rural district—smaller than parish	38	37	44	8	7	12
{ Part of town/city—group of streets (polling district)	8	7	12	1	1	—
{ Part of town/city—one street or smaller	1	1	—	*	—	1
Don't know/not answered	1	1	—	*	—	1

\* Incl. 3 Q.N.A.

† Incl. 2 Q.N.A.



Perhaps the first point we may make on this analysis is that, in both urban and rural interviews, there was a slight indication that persons who did not feel they "belonged" to the home area were more likely to describe that area in terms of a smaller size:

smaller than parish equivalent (rural),

a group of streets, or just one street, around the informant's home (urban).

Since it is possible to hypothesise that informants with no attachment to an immediate area might conceive instead of a less specific, and therefore wider area in which they reside, work, shop, etc., we might bear in mind the consideration that the form of the question itself may have encouraged a description in terms of a smaller area. We might further suppose, however, that the criteria which these non-adherents had in mind in describing the area where they were currently living were probably different from those of informants who felt some ties to the place. For example, they may on the contrary have been likely to think of a more precise location in which their home is situated, rather than an area in which socialised activities were carried on. Other than to mention this point, though, there was little variation of practical importance between area adherents and non-adherents in their descriptions of the extent of their respective home areas.

Generally speaking, there was a tendency for the "home" area to be perceived as more limited in extent in rural than in urban areas (by the criterion of comparison which we are using). Thus, as many as 85 % of rural district residents described the "home" area as roughly the size of a parish, or smaller. This figure was 92 % among those with no feeling of allegiance to the area. It might be concluded that in both cases these proportions are fairly large. In urban areas, less than one-fifth of those with an affirmative expression of community belonging thought of the "home" area in terms approximately equivalent to the local authority area in which they were resident, while very few indeed conceptualised an area of a larger size than this. In the rural districts, the expression of a "home" area in terms equivalent to the rural district area itself was confined to a minute proportion of informants. This size of area, being a somewhat formal and possibly artificial division anyway, seemed to bear no relation to the subjective conceptualisations of rural district residents as to the extent of their community areas.

It is interesting to note that in urban interviews, among electors who felt a sense of belonging to a "home" area, the tendency to think of that area as the *whole* of the town/city (i.e. the local authority area rather than a district of it), was correlated with proximity of residence to the centre of the town—i.e. the town hall.

TABLE 6 (Q.3a-3c)

Size of "home" area, and distance of residence from town hall

<i>Base: (urban informants with a "home" area)</i>	<i>Up to ¼ mile</i>	<i>¼-½ mile</i>	<i>½-1 mile</i>	<i>1-1½ miles</i>	<i>1½-2 miles</i>	<i>2-3 miles</i>	<i>3+ miles</i>
	76	155	296	183	218	201	160
<i>% describing home area in terms equivalent to local authority area</i>	51 %	34 %	26 %	16 %	13 %	7 %	6 %

However, most of the electors in our sample lived in off-centre, or suburban, locations. This may suggest the existence of some sort of alienative process: that the further a person lives away from the centre of the town, the weaker is his identification with the *totality* of the settlement and by extension, the less strong

his feeling of belonging to the other districts comprised within the total local authority area.

For this same group of electors (those in urban areas who could consider a "home" area to which they belonged) we have analysed their replies as to the extent of that area by population size within type of authority:

TABLE 7 (Q.3a-3e)  
Size of "home" area, and population size of local authority area

Type of local authority: Population size: Base: (all with "home" area)	C.B.				M.B./U.D.				
	Total 573	Con- urba- tion 225	250,000+ 161	60,000- 250,000 187	Total 730	Con- urba- tion 89	60,000- 100,000 164*	30,000- 60,000 230	Up to 30,000 341
Size of "home" area:	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Local authority area, or larger	10	4	5	22	34	21	17	25	46
Ward equivalent†	35	35	31	40	30	40	27	38	21
Polling district equivalent	47	53	55	33	28	34	40	29	25
Smaller than polling district	7	7	9	5	8	4	15	7	7
D.K./Q.N.A.	1	1	—	1	1	—	1	1	1

\* Including supplementary sample.

† Including an area between ward and local authority area size.

It can be clearly seen, in spite of certain inconsistencies in the overall pattern, that a feeling of "limitation" or "localisation" is more frequently present in descriptions of the "home" area given by informants particularly in very large towns and conurbations. Very few electors indeed perceive their community area as embracing the totality of these local authority areas. In the smaller towns, however (which may in fact resemble much more closely in population and geographical size the wards of large cities), the tendency is more towards an expression of the whole area as the "home" area.

It is almost certain that the findings from the above two sets of correlation (Tables 6 and 7) are reflections one of the other. That is, in smaller local authorities, of necessity, there is a greater likelihood of informants living nearer to their respective town halls.

Looking again at this crucial group of informants—those in urban areas who can conceive of a "home" area—we can again see a reflection of the effect of size of urban settlement (since population density is often a function of this) upon those conceptions (Table 8).

With increasing density (persons per acre) there is a clear tendency towards narrower delineation of the "home" area. This is possibly in line with our comments above concerning the isolation of districts in pockets of community throughout large urban and conurbation settlements. It also certainly reflects and is reflected in the closer clustering of social institutions in areas of greater population density—institutions (such as schools, clubs, churches and so on) which may be taken *prima facie* as components of community structure. This survey does not enable us precisely to define these "pockets" of community, neither does it allow us to say with any confidence whether or how they merge into each other.



TABLE 8 (Q.3a-3c)  
Size of "home" area, and population density

Base: (urban informants with a "home" area)	Persons per acre				
	Up to 5 279	Over 5-10 262	Over 10-15 288	Over 15-20 183	20+ 291
Size of "home" area:	%	%	%	%	%
Local authority area, or larger	33	25	22	15	19
Ward equivalent*	33	36	30	32	30
Polling district equivalent	25	33	37	43	47
Smaller than polling district	7	6	11	9	4
D.K./Q.N.A.	3	*	—	1	*

\* Including an area between ward and local authority area size.

Table 9 presents analyses of informants' answers as to the size of their "home" areas by socio-economic status and education. It will be seen that the higher the educational attainment of the elector, the larger is his/her conceptualisation of the "home" area:

TABLE 9 (Q.3a-3c)  
Size of "home" area, by socio-economic status and education

Base: (informants with a "home" area)	Socio-economic status						Education		
	1 77	2 133	Group 3 578	4 392	5 407	Never employed/ others 122	Higher 105	Second- ary 320	Lower 1285
Size of "home" area:	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Local authority area, or larger	25	23	22	22	17	24	31	25	20
Ward equivalent*	48	36	34	35	36	36	36	38	35
Polling district equivalent	26	37	37	38	39	36	27	31	39
Smaller than polling district	—	4	6	5	7	3	4	5	6
D.K./Q.N.A.	1	—	1	*	1	1	2	1	*

\* Including an area between ward and local authority area size.

Certain implications may be evident in the findings from this part of the survey for the optimum size of local government area. Firstly, notwithstanding the smaller urban authorities, where a considerably larger proportion of electors exists which can conceptualise an area to which they belong and which at the same time comprises roughly the total extent of the local authority area as present constituted, it is clear that few electors feel a sense of identification with the entire area making up present local authority divisions. Even less, we may claim, will they "belong" to areas of a still larger size (and more disparate nature). The evidence of this survey suggests that the unit of local government which reflects most closely the size of community areas, as conceptualised by the majority of our informants, is the present ward/parish equivalent, or possibly even smaller than this. Such an observation would apply equally to both urban and rural authorities. We may in fact anticipate a later section of the report to underline this

conclusion by data on informants' opinions as to the "ideal" extent of area which they feel their local councillor should represent: among electors with an expressed opinion, 93 % felt that the area of representation should be no larger than ward/parish size.

## 2. Nature

In this section, and prior to a rather more detailed examination of what the home community area actually constitutes in terms of individual activities and interests, we present the findings from two sets of questions which aimed to gauge informants' perceptions of any quality of distinctness which differentiated their "home" area (as they had defined it) from the area(s) surrounding it.\* Thus, we are dealing here with entirely subjective opinions and perceptions.

The ability to be able to itemise any distinguishing features at all between the "home" and surrounding areas was, rather surprisingly perhaps, almost constant for both informants who claimed attachment to that "home" area and those who did not (59 and 60 % respectively). There were some very evident variations nevertheless, between these two groups of electors in terms of the actual points of differentiation which they enumerated. These may be summed up quite simply in the not unexpected finding that the former—electors feeling a sense of belonging to the "home" area—found positive and pleasant aspects of the area upon which to comment, whilst non-adherents were somewhat more inclined to express denigratory opinions of the "home" area in comparing it with the surrounding streets and regions:

TABLE 10 (Q.6)

### Differences between "home" area and surrounding areas

(Base)	Informants with a "home" area 1710	Informants without a "home" area 484
	%	
Differences favourable to "home" area	50	29
Differences unfavourable to "home" area	11	28
Non-evaluative differences†	19	25
No differences	41	40

Table 11, which presents the more frequently mentioned responses, shows that on the whole considerations of the physical appearance of the area were uppermost. It is difficult to present precise figures, due to the duplication of response by individual informants, nevertheless it remains apparent that physical descriptions of the area outweighed expressions of it in terms of its human elements.

To some extent this emphasis upon the physical nature of the area may have resulted from the peculiarities of question-wording, but we are inclined not to

\* So as to provide an appropriate point of reference, the "areas round about" were taken to extend to a geographical distance approximately equal to the size of the "home" area (as described) itself. Thus, if the "home" area had been described as of county size, then we were referring to the counties surrounding it; if described as just three or four streets, we asked informants to envisage the difference, if any, between these and the area comprised of a further three/four streets beyond it.

† "Non-evaluative differences" comprise comments of an entirely descriptive nature; that is, those which do not appear to contain either a favourable or an unfavourable expression of opinion.



TABLE 11 (Q.6)

## Differences between "home" area and surrounding areas

(Base)	Informants with "home" area 1710	Informants without "home" area 484
	%	%
<i>Descriptions of "home" area:</i>		
Nicer area physically	30	18
Worse area physically	3	11
Plenty of facilities	5	3
Lack of facilities	4	6
Other (non-evaluative) descriptions of area	12	14
More select people	6	4
Less select people	2	5
People friendlier	7	3
People less friendly	2	4
Other (non-evaluative) descriptions of people	2	4
Other favourable comments on people in area	2	2
Other unfavourable comments on people in area	*	2
Other answers	4	5
Don't know	1	2
No differences	41	40

assign this great consequence. We see below (Table 13) that less than half of our informants could itemise any difference between the people in and outside their "home" areas even after a specific probe on this proposition. This is not the point at which to discuss the composition of community feelings (though we shall see in the subsequent section of this report that it is a group of indices concerned with the interaction of the individual with other people—rather than with his relationship to his *physical* environment—which appears to have the strongest indicative power in respect of involvement with the "home" area). Nevertheless, at first sight this emphasis upon the environmental aspects does strike one as a little contradictory to this latter finding.

Table 14 contains analyses of informants' perceptions of the difference between "home" and other areas in terms of four standard breakdowns. It will be seen that they reveal little consistent variation. We would only note that the small group of electors in the highest socio-economic group tends slightly more to use objective descriptions to differentiate the "home" area, and comments more frequently upon the physical attractions of the area.

There were some variations in the extent to which *evaluative* descriptions of the physical nature of the "home" area were given, particularly in respect for example of the population density of the ward or parish in which our electors resided. Favourable expressions in support of the physical appearance of the area were most prevalent in wards and parishes of middle-range density, rather than at either the lowly- or highly-populated ends of the scale.

We would presume that these middle-range wards and parishes display the physical characteristics which we might associate with estate developments, well-planned suburbs, the "stockbroker belt" and so on. They are, therefore, easily

distinguishable both from the older and more crowded districts closer to town centres and from the more rural areas which surround them on their expanding flank. Bearing in mind the relatively small average size of the "home" area as defined by the majority of our sample, it is reasonable conversely to assume also that wards and parishes of either very high or, more particularly, very low population density display more uniformity of appearance with their contiguous areas; there is less stimulus therefore to distinguish them in these terms.

TABLE 12 (Q.6)  
Differences between "home" area and surrounding areas, and population density

<i>Persons per acre: (Base)</i>	0-1 307	1-5 517	5-10 365	10-15 380	15-20 242	20+ 388
"Home" area:	%	%	%	%	%	%
A "nicer" area physically	15	26	37	32	34	20
A worse area physically	3	4	4	5	5	7
No differences between "home" and surrounding areas	54	40	34	34	39	43

Of those informants who had not mentioned any differences between the "home" and surrounding areas in terms of some aspect of the people resident there, we asked specifically whether they *could* make any distinction between the areas in this respect. Responses thus obtained can be added to the relevant answers from the former question to show firstly that over half of the sample (53%) were unable to differentiate in any way between the two sets of residents. There was a small variation between community adherents (54%) and non-adherents (49%) over this, but not one to which we would devote much attention.

TABLE 13 (Q.6, 7a, 7b)  
Differences between people in "home" area and surrounding areas

<i>(Base)</i>	<i>Informants with "home" area 1710</i>	<i>Informants without "home" area 484</i>
	%	%
<i>People in "home" area:</i>		
Friendlier	18	10
"Nicer"/easy to live with/polite	5	3
Other (favourable) comments	1	1
Not so friendly	7	16
"Not so nice" etc.	1	4
Independent/narrow-minded/out of touch	1	1
Other (unfavourable) comments	*	1
Higher social class/more select	9	6
Lower social class/less select	3	8
Different jobs/employment	*	1
Younger people/families	1	2
Older people	2	1
Other (descriptive, non-evaluative) answers	3	7
Don't know	*	*
No differences	54	49



TABLE  
Differences between "home" area

(Base)	Type and size of local authority									
	C.B.				M.B./U.D.					R.D.
	Total 751	Con- urban- tion 294	60,000 to 250,000 206	250,000 to 600,000 251	Total 910	Con- urban- tion 113	60,000 to 100,000 235*	100,000 to 30,000 268	Up to 30,000 417	Total 538
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Descriptions of "home" area:										
Nicer area physically	29	30	30	27	30	34	26	32	28	20
Worse area physically	6	7	7	5	4	5	5	2	5	4
Plenty of facilities	5	5	4	7	4	4	3	3	4	3
Lack of facilities	2	1	4	2	5	7	4	3	6	6
Other (non-evaluative) descriptions of area	10	11	8	12	15	10	10	15	18	14
More select people	7	5	9	9	6	5	8	7	3	2
Less select people	4	3	6	4	2	2	4	1	2	1
People friendlier	5	4	5	6	5	2	6	6	6	7
People less friendly	3	1	4	4	2	2	*	3	1	2
Other (non-evaluative) descriptions of people	3	3	2	4	2	1	2	2	2	1
Other favourable comments on people in area	2	3	1	3	2	—	2	1	1	3
Other unfavourable comments on people in area	1	—	—	3	*	—	—	1	*	1
Other answers	3	3	2	3	3	6	2	3	3	4
Don't know	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	*	1
No differences	38	38	34	42	37	35	40	36	40	50

\* Including supplementary sample.

† For explanation of the categories, see Appendix A.

The forms of distinction quoted seem to cluster around two basic dimensions, which we may categorise as "sociability" and "status". These two sets of descriptions are of course not necessarily divorced from each other: awareness of social distance may easily be connected with propensity to social participation and interaction. We would suggest that responses of the latter type, those concerned with status variations between "home" area residents and people in surrounding areas, are quite close in concept to the answers above distinguishing the area in physical terms. They represent a further characteristic of the outward appearance of the area; they help to measure its status comparative to other, contiguous, areas. They do not, we think, necessarily relate consistently to the degree of identification which the informant may have with the area.

Responses made along the dimension of what we have termed "sociability" on the other hand—whilst, in their positive form, they may be merely a justification of lower social status (which the informant perceives himself as sharing)—are nevertheless more likely to approximate to a truer expression of community

14 (Q.6)  
and surrounding areas

Size of "home" area††						Socio-economic status						Education			
"Ext- ended" 127	Town/ City equiv. 305	Ward equiv. + 527	Part of ward 769	Parish 236	Part of parish 218	Group					Never employed/ others 153	Higher 129	Second- ary 448	Lower 1622	
						1 97	2 168	3 773	4 477	5 531					
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
22	30	30	30	18	21	41	26	27	30	25	22	33	28	27	27
2	5	6	5	3	6	6	4	6	4	5	3	5	6	5	5
2	6	5	3	3	2	3	4	4	5	4	1	6	4	4	4
7	7	3	3	6	6	1	4	5	5	5	1	1	4	4	5
17	15	12	11	16	13	24	16	14	11	11	9	19	19	11	11
3	3	5	9	3	2	9	7	6	5	4	7	8	7	5	5
1	2	3	4	2	1	4	2	3	2	3	1	5	2	3	3
7	5	5	6	8	7	5	5	6	6	5	6	5	7	5	5
1	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	1	3	2	2	2
1	2	3	2	1	1	3	2	3	1	3	2	5	2	2	2
2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	1	3	2	2
—	1	1	*	2	*	1	1	1	*	1	—	1	1	1	1
9	5	3	2	3	3	5	5	4	4	2	1	8	3	3	3
2	1	1	1	1	*	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	1
49	37	38	38	52	47	20	36	38	42	45	55	26	36	43	43

† Q.N.A.: 17 informants.

involvement. This is emphasised by a summary analysis of responses in terms of informants with and without a "home" area, where clear discrimination is shown:

TABLE 15 (Q.6, 7a, 7b)

Differences between people in "home" area and surrounding areas

(Base)	Informants with "home" area 1710	Informants without "home" area 484
	%	%
People in "home" area:		
Friendlier/"nicer"/easy to live with/ polite	22	13
Not so friendly/not so "nice", etc.	8	20

Considering a simple urban-rural continuum ranging from county boroughs through to rural parishes, we may note a tendency for expressions of distinction based on social status to be more frequent among informants in more urban local authorities. An inverse decline in the likelihood of distinguishing between the two sets of people on grounds of sociability is not so apparent.

TABLE 16 (Q.6, 7a, 7b)

Differences between people in "home" area and surrounding areas, by type of local authority

(Row)	C.B. 751	M.B./U.D. 910	P.D. 538
"Sociability" distinctions	% 28	% 33	% 33
"Status" distinctions	17	14	9

TABLE 17 (Q.6, 7a, b)

Differences between the people in "home" and surrounding areas

(Row)	Type and size of local authority									
	C.B.					M.B./U.D.				
	Total 751	Con- urba- tion 254	250,000+ 206	60,000 to 250,000 251		Total 910	Con- urba- tion 113	60,000 to 100,000 235*	30,000 to 60,000 288	Up to 30,000 417
										R.D. Total 538
"Sociability" distinctions	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
"Status" distinctions	10	13	15	12	17	10	15	15	21	17
"Sociability" distinctions	5	3	2	4	5	4	6	3	5	3
"Status" distinctions	1	1	*	2	1	—	2	*	1	1
"Sociability" distinctions	8	6	6	12	9	12	8	11	7	11
"Status" distinctions	2	3	2	1	2	3	1	2	2	1
"Sociability" distinctions	*	*	—	—	1	—	1	1	1	2
"Status" distinctions	1	—	—	2	*	—	—	1	*	1
"Sociability" distinctions	10	9	11	11	9	11	11	11	4	6
"Status" distinctions	7	6	9	6	4	4	5	4	2	2
"Sociability" distinctions	*	—	—	1	1	3	2	1	*	1
"Status" distinctions	1	1	1	*	2	4	1	2	1	1
"Sociability" distinctions	1	1	1	*	3	1	4	2	3	2
"Status" distinctions	9	6	9	2	4	4	3	2	5	5
"Sociability" distinctions	8	8	8	—	*	—	*	*	*	*
"Status" distinctions	51	44	44	44	52	54	48	50	53	56

There was an indication also that residents of longer standing in their respective "home" areas were less inclined to comment (either positively or negatively) upon the "sociability" of people within the area compared with others. We might suppose that the longer the individual's period of residence, the weaker may be the stimulus of comparative experience of surrounding areas.

Table 17 below contains further analyses in terms of size of local authority, size of "home" area, socio-economic status and education of the informant.

While the differences involved are perhaps not so great as to permit full statistical confidence, we might nevertheless conclude that they strongly suggest a variation in response by socio-economic status: while the higher groups more frequently quote "status" differences, the complementary lower groups tend more often to mention differences in terms of sociability and personality characteristics. This variation is reflected, to a lesser extent, in the breakdown by education.

Residents in the smallest towns (municipal boroughs and urban districts of less than 30,000 inhabitants) most frequently quote the friendliness of their "home" area neighbours.

Size of "home" area†							Socio-economic status					Education		
"Ex- tended"	Town/ City equiv. 305	Ward equiv. 527	Part of ward 769	Parish 236	Part of parish 218		Group	4	5	Never employed others 153		Higher	Second- ary	Lower
127							1	2	3	4	5	129	448	1622
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
22	16	14	16	14	18	9	13	16	16	18	17	12	15	16
8	3	3	7	3	2	4	5	4	4	5	5	3	5	4
2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	—	1	1
13	12	8	8	9	12	8	8	9	9	12	4	8	9	9
2	1	2	2	1	*	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	2
6	1	*	—	3	*	1	3	1	*	1	—	4	1	*
—	1	1	*	1	*	1	1	1	*	1	—	1	1	*
6	5	8	12	6	6	14	15	8	8	7	10	11	12	8
3	3	6	6	2	2	5	4	6	4	4	2	5	4	—
1	—	1	*	1	1	1	1	1	*	*	1	1	2	*
1	1	1	2	*	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	5	1	1
5	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	3	1	2	2	3	2
6	5	4	2	5	5	10	3	3	4	3	4	9	6	2
—	*	*	*	*	*	—	—	1	*	*	—	1	*	*
42	54	56	49	59	56	49	54	52	56	53	56	47	50	54

† Q.N.A.: 17 informants.



## Summary

1. Nearly four in five electors claim to possess some feelings of attachment to a "home" community area. Propensity to have such a feeling is positively correlated with length of residence in the area.
2. The community area, as defined by electors, is not geographically extensive. In the majority of cases, it is considerably smaller than the size of the local authority areas in which electors reside. In urban authority areas, approximately three-quarters of electors define their "home" area as being of a size no larger than the equivalent of a ward; of these, the majority define its extent as being approximately the size of a group of streets or smaller. In rural areas, 85% of electors define the "home" area as being of a size equivalent to a parish or smaller.
3. Informants living closer to the centre of their respective authority area and those living in smaller urban local authorities are considerably more likely than others to conceptualise their "home" area as comprising the *whole* of that local authority area.
4. With increasing density of population, there is a tendency towards a narrower delineation of the "home" area, suggesting "pocket" communities distributed throughout urban settlements.
5. The higher the educational attainment of the elector, the wider is his/her conceptualisation of the "home" area. Since educational attainment is correlated with socio-economic status, a similar tendency to association is apparent between higher status and a more widely defined "home" area.
6. In distinguishing the "home" community area from surrounding areas, informants on the whole have considerations of physical appearance uppermost in their minds. Mental distinctions in human terms are less evident, but when they are made, are generally expressed in terms either of the sociability or status/prestige of the two groups of people concerned.

## SECTION B

### COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

#### Introduction

In this section we deal with the *nature* of a person's involvement with and participation in community affairs. These latter activities may comprise a range of different types of formal and informal behaviour patterns. We included a number of such behavioural indices in the questionnaire, and in addition to studying their contribution to involvement in the community setting, the main form of analysis throughout has constituted a measure of the extent to which the defined community area, and the existing local authority area each comprise the location for these activities.

We should note also that a person's involvement with his local area may be, for want of a better word, "measurable" in terms of certain subjective or attitudinal indices. These report his or her feelings with regard to the area, rather than document specific aspects of social activity which may be carried on there.

Thirdly, in discussing the subject we have termed "community involvement", we must bear in mind that this is not a unidimensional concept. There are certainly different *types* of community involvement. Furthermore, we should wish to know precisely *which* aspects of life are most important in contributing towards an individual's potentiality for involvement in his or her community. In an attempt therefore to explore more thoroughly the nature (or several natures) of involvement in and identification with the "home" area, we have also carried out a factor analysis using a series of different questions taken from this survey, and including both behavioural and attitudinal indicators. This analysis, and the categorisation of electors on the basis of it, is contained in Section G of this report.

#### 1. Attitudinal Indices

In addition to the fairly direct question contained in Question 2 which we have studied in the first section, there were three other indices in the survey which attempted to obtain a subjective assessment of the individual's involvement with his or her "home" (community) area.

One of these, Q.20e, we consider to have been of only marginal utility due to conceptual constraints inherent in its very form, though we comment later upon it. The remaining two, however (and one of them in particular) appear to possess excellent powers of discrimination between informants according to the factor of involvement. Dealing firstly with the more successful of these—Question 10—we may see that nearly three-quarters of those informants who had said they could conceive of an area to which they belonged, and where they felt "at home",

TABLE 18 (Q.10)  
"Supposing you had to move away from (the 'home' area), how sorry or pleased would you be?"

(Base)	Informants with "home" area 1710	Informants without "home" area 484
	%	%
Very sorry to leave	48	14
Quite sorry to leave	26	17
Neither sorry nor pleased	17	31
Quite pleased to leave	5	14
Very pleased to leave	4	23
(Don't know)	*	1



confirmed their claim in stating that they would be "quite" or "very sorry" to leave that area. (Table 18).

Table 19 illustrates the extent to which an answer of "very sorry\* to leave" varies according to a number of factors, some of them not entirely surprising ones.

TABLE 19 (Q.10)  
Proportion of informants "very sorry" to leave "home" area

<i>All informants</i>		(Base) (2199)	% 41
<i>Type of local authority:</i>			
C.B.		(751)	33
M.B./U.D.		(910)	45
R.D.		(538)	45
<i>Population size:</i>			
C.B.	Conurbation	(294)	34
	250,000+	(206)	31
	60,000-250,000	(251)	34
M.B./U.D.	Conurbation	(113)	39
	60,000-100,000	(235)†	39
	30,000-60,000	(288)	42
	Up to 30,000	(417)	48
Q.2	Informants with a "home" area	(1710)	48
	Informants without a "home" area (Q.N.A.)	(484) (5)	14 —
<i>Size of "home" area:</i>			
"Extended" area		(127)	43
Town/city equivalent		(305)	44
Ward equivalent or larger		(527)	39
Part of ward		(769)	38
Parish equivalent		(236)	47
Part of parish		(218)	45
(Q.N.A.)		(17)	—
<i>Age:</i>			
21-34		(524)	30
35-44		(444)	34
45-54		(447)	41
55-64		(395)	48
65+		(377)	56
(Q.N.A.)		(12)	—
<i>Length of residence in "home" area:</i>			
Up to 3 years		(336)	32
Over 3-10 years		(491)	34
Over 10-20 years		(435)	32
Over 20 years		(573)	53
Born here		(364)	49
<i>Socio-economic status:</i>			
Group 1		(97)	46
2		(168)	47
3		(773)	37
4		(477)	38
5		(531)	41
Never employed/others		153	56

† Including supplementary sample.

\* By cross-analysis with other subjective and behavioural indicators of community involvement it was established that this answer on the 5-point scale from "very sorry" through to "very pleased" differentiates most clearly between informants in terms of their responses to the other indicative questions.

The most outstanding differences (that is, the sub-groups sharing the greatest proclivity to respond "very sorry") are found among:

- (expectedly) informants who can conceive of an area to which they feel they "belong", compared with those who can not;
- informants who have lived over 20 years in their "home" area, including those born in the area. There is no noticeable difference in attachment according to any shorter length of residence;
- there is a clear correlation with increasing age;
- there is less "sorrow" at leaving the home area among electors living in C.B.'s compared with those resident in the smaller towns and country areas (M.B.'s, U.D.'s, R.D.'s), where a substantially higher proportion of informants would be "very sorry" to leave. There is a suggestion, also, that informants living in the smallest urban authority areas would more frequently be "very sorry" to leave;
- there is some very slight indication finally of differences according to socio-economic status, where we find that the two highest groups—living, as they are more likely to do, in more "select" or physically attractive neighbourhoods—appear somewhat more sorry to leave.

There was no observable difference of any note between the replies of men and women to this question. Further comments arising from the study of this question (in relation to other indicators of community involvement) are made in the later section of this report dealing with the factor analysis.

The second useful subjective expression of involvement with the "home" area was contained in Question 8 ("How interested are you to know what goes on in . . . .?"). Although quite highly correlated with the other direct (subjective) indicators, Q.2 and Q.10, it was clearly not quite as fine a measure of involvement as the latter. This may be briefly illustrated by Table 20 below which indicates for example that as a predictor of an answer of "very sorry" at Q.10, it was quite poor. Moreover, although a response of "very interested" correlated highly with the proclivity to have a "home" area, so too did other answers suggesting lower interest.

TABLE 20 (Q.2, 8, 10)  
Cross-analysis of three "direct" indicators

(Base)	Q.8	
	"Very interested" 448	"Quite interested—Not at all interested" 1745
Q.2 With "home" area	% 86	% 76
Without "home" area	14	24
Q.10 Very sorry	58	36
Quite sorry—very pleased	42	64

Viewing these figures another way, however, only six in ten of those electors with a "home" area were "quite interested" or "very interested" in the happenings of that area. The proportion in the extreme category of "very interested" was as low as 23%. (Table 21).



TABLE 21 (Q.2, 8)  
 "How interested are you to know what goes on in ('home' area)?"

(Base)	Q.2	
	Informants with "home" area 1710	Informants without "home" area 484
Very interested	23%	12%
Quite interested	37	29
Only a little interested	26	31
Not at all interested	13	27

In anticipation of later comments, we may hazard the opinion here that this question is only in part measuring involvement in or identification with the community area. It is additionally being influenced by some other factor(s), one of which might be social awareness.

Notwithstanding this, we may itemise the significant variations which occurred among various sub-groups within the sample in their answers to this question. These are contained in Table 22 on the next page.

The degree of interest shown in the local community is related most clearly perhaps to:

- socio-economic status: the two highest groups in particular again show some differentiation from the others in exhibiting a considerably greater degree of interest, though there is an evident tendency for a relationship (in respect of decreasing interest) to occur across the span of socio-economic groups, as one moves from higher to lower;
- residence in "home" area: once again it is the elector who was born in the "home" area or has lived there over twenty years who shows a higher degree of interest in its happenings. Length of residence otherwise reveals no variations in the degree of interest;
- an analysis in terms of age shows, with advancing years, a very evident tendency to move to more extreme answers (i.e. "very interested" or "not at all interested"). Apart from this, however, we can not conclude that interest in local happenings is related to age;
- type of local authority: a very slight tendency is visible for greater interest in the area to be shown as one moves along the CB-MB/UD-RD continuum. There is very little consistent variation in terms of population size within this typology of local authorities;
- size of "home" area: one size of area in particular appears to evoke a higher degree of interest: the larger, "extended" region comprising a County or other area larger than a local authority area; to a lesser extent, there is a slightly higher degree of interest shown by informants conceptualising a "home" area approximately equivalent to parish size. The former size category includes a large proportion of answers given by electors in rural districts (64% of the 127 in this group); the latter category is made up entirely of R.D. residents. Thus, we might conclude that a simple urban/rural variation is present, with rural electors showing, as we have just noted above, a higher level of interest in the affairs of their "home" areas.

Again, no significant variation is apparent between the answers of men and women to this question.

TABLE 22 (Q.8)  
 "How interested are you to know what goes on in ("home" area)?"

(Base)	All informants 2199	Size of "home" area*						Type and size of local authority									
		"Ex- tended" area 127	Town/ city equiv. 305	Ward equiv. and larger 527	Part of ward 769	Parish equiv. 236	Part of parish 218	C.B.				M.B./U.D.				R.D.	
								Total 751	Con- urba- tion 294	250,000+ 206	60,000- 250,000 251	Total 910	Con- urba- tion 113	60,000- 100,000 235†	30,000- 60,000 288	Up to 30,000 417	Total 538
Very interested	20	28	20	20	18	28	20	19	19	18	20	19	19	20	18	21	24
Quite interested	35	52	42	37	29	34	34	30	30	29	32	38	32	36	37	39	38
Only a little interested	27	15	26	28	29	28	30	29	26	29	33	27	26	29	29	24	26
Not at all interested	17	5	12	15	24	10	14	21	24	24	15	16	23	15	16	16	11
(Don't know)	1	1	*	—	*	—	1	*	1	—	—	*	—	*	—	—	1

\* Q.N.A. 17.

† Including supplementary sample.

(Base)	Socio-economic status						Residence in "home" area					Age‡				
	Group					Never employed/others	Up to 3 years	Over 3-10 years	Over 10-20 years	Over 20 years	Born here	21-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
	1 97	2 168	3 773	4 477	5 531	153	336	491	435	573	364	524	444	447	395	377
Very interested	35	30	21	19	17	18	17	18	15	25	27	15	21	20	24	25
Quite interested	36	39	40	33	31	32	37	35	36	32	38	40	38	41	29	26
Only a little interested	22	23	24	30	32	29	28	29	30	27	23	33	28	24	27	23
Not at all interested	7	10	15	18	21	21	18	18	19	16	12	13	13	15	19	25
(Don't know)	—	—	1	—	*	—	*	*	—	1	—	—	*	—	1	1

‡ Q.N.A. 12.



In designing Question 20(e) which deals with electors' attitudes towards sending their children to local schools, the underlying hypothesis was that a negative opinion might be indicative of a rejection of the particular area. Our aim was basically to get informants to try to assume that all other contingent factors were equal (such as availability of a school in the area, educational status, quality of teaching staff, and of physical facilities, etc.) so that the school might be viewed as a standard of the local community. It was very soon evident, however, that an almost impossible task was involved technically in isolating in informants' minds the *idea* or conception of a local school from the desire (or need) to visualise it in terms highly coloured by experience of the *actual* availability and condition of local schools. Thus the results we have obtained may fall between the two stools and reflect an unusable mixture of attitude and reported fact.

It may be seen firstly from Table 23 below that whilst the extent of recommendation for a school *inside* the informant's "home" area was fairly similar for nursery and primary schools, it was slightly lower in respect of secondary education—that is, a somewhat greater proportion of electors recommended a school outside the "home" area. (This, of course, may well mirror the fact that in their own particular circumstances, given the relatively small size of the area as defined by many informants, the nearest secondary school *is* presently located outside that area.)

TABLE 23 (Q.20e)

"If a friend of yours in ('home' area), had a child of nursery/primary/secondary school age and asked your advice, would you recommend him to send the child to school in ('home' area) or outside it?"

(Base)	Nursery school 2199	Primary school 2199	Secondary school 2199
Strongly recommend a school in "home" area	% 52	% 51	% 44
Fairly strongly recommend a school in "home" area	23	25	20
Neither one way nor the other	14	11	13
Fairly strongly recommend a school outside "home" area	3	5	9
Strongly recommend a school outside "home" area	4	5	10
(Don't know/Q.N.A.)	4	3	4

We have further summarised answers to the question in the form of the number of recommendations (either "strongly" or "fairly strongly") made by each elector for the three types of school:

- informants from the higher socio-economic groups are less disposed towards recommending schools in their "home" area for all three quoted educational levels, as are informants who themselves come into the highest educational group. Clearly, these two variations are closely related, and may well be the result as much of a wider experience of educational facilities in and outside the area as of attitude towards the area itself.
- there is an evident tendency for blanket recommendations to increase with a longer period of residence in the area (i.e. implying diminishing experience outside?).
- expectedly, informants with a feeling of belonging to the "home" area are more likely to give a three-fold recommendation than those without.

TABLE 24 (Q.20e)  
Number of recommendations for a school in the "home" area

		Number of recommendations for "home" area				
(Base)		Nil	1	2	3	
		%	%	%	%	
All informants	(2199)	17	8	18	57	
Socio-economic status:						
Group 1	(97)	16	11	24	47	
2	(168)	19	4	20	57	
3	(773)	16	10	20	54	
4	(477)	17	5	17	61	
5	(531)	16	7	14	63	
Never employed/others	(153)	22	8	21	49	
Education:						
Higher	(129)	11	9	30	50	
Secondary	(448)	16	9	22	53	
Lower	(1622)	18	7	16	59	
Residence:						
Up to 3 years	(336)	23	10	20	47	
Over 3-10 years	(491)	18	9	18	55	
Over 10-20 years	(435)	16	8	18	58	
Over 20 years/born here	(937)	15	6	18	61	
Q.2.						
With a "home" area	(1710)	14	7	18	61	
Without a "home" area	(484)	26	9	21	44	
(Q.N.A.)	(5)					
Size of "home" area:						
"Extended" area	(127)	8	6	19	67	
Town/city equivalent	(305)	13	6	12	69	
Ward equivalent or larger	(527)	16	6	18	59	
Part of ward	(769)	19	9	19	53	
Parish equivalent	(236)	15	12	18	55	
Part of parish	(218)	22	9	22	46	
(Q.N.A.)	(17)					
Type and size of local authority:						
C.B.	Total	(751)	20	6	17	57
	Conurbation	(294)	21	6	20	53
	250,000+	(206)	24	7	16	53
	60,000-250,000	(251)	16	5	13	66
M.B./U.D.	Total	(910)	15	8	18	59
	Conurbation	(113)	18	11	27	44
	60,000-100,000	(235)*	16	12	21	51
	30,000-60,000	(288)	14	7	15	64
	Up to 30,000	(417)	12	7	16	65
R.D. total	(538)	17	10	20	53	

\* Including supplementary sample.

The difference between these is not as great as might be imagined however; (as many as 44% of the latter informants still recommend the "home" area for all three types of school). This may be taken to confirm that the question is not a powerful discriminator in terms of community involvement.



— finally, and quite logically, the larger the “home” area is perceived to be, generally, the greater the likelihood of informants being able to recommend that area for all three types of school.

## 2. Behavioural characteristics

### *Introduction*

The Royal Commission has expressed great interest in obtaining data on various aspects of social behaviour which may be carried on, broadly-speaking, in a community setting and which may therefore be seen not only as contributing towards community life but at the same time as constituting an expression of it. The range of these activities is wide: it encompasses not only leisure pursuits but other more necessary aspects of life such as employment, shopping and schooling. Moreover, to these we must add other indices of human life which, if not strictly behavioural, may *prima facie* be regarded nevertheless as essential characteristics of community structure; these include patterns of residence, kinship and acquaintance.

Separate questions were asked in each of these areas of study and in the subsequent commentary we report upon them in turn. We shall also attempt to summarise them, and in Section G we further investigate their individual contribution to overall measures of involvement with the community. In reporting upon the levels of activity in many of these aspects of community life, we shall be concerned to show how far (a) the “home” area, as individually defined, and (b) the elector’s own local authority area each can be regarded as containing the geographical location of the activity. In this way, we may obtain a further guide as to the extent to which these two types of area may in fact be regarded as coincident with community areas.

### (a) *Residence*

TABLE 25 (Q.1, 4a)

Length of residence at present address, and in “home” area

(Base)	At present address (Q.1) 2199	In “home” area (Q.4a) 2199
	%	%
<i>Length of residence:</i>		
Less than 1 year	4	2
Over 1 year, up to 3 years	18	13
Over 3 years, up to 5 years	12	8
Over 5 years, up to 10 years	20	14
Over 10 years, up to 20 years	23	20
Over 20 years	20	26
Born here (and continuous residence)	2	17

Not far short of half of the sample (45%) had lived at their present address for more than 10 years. Sixty-two per cent had lived within the “home” area, as they defined it, for a similar length of time.

It should be borne in mind that since no substitution procedure was employed for electors in the sample who had moved from the address at which they were registered for election purposes, it is likely that we have under-represented (even if only marginally) people of *very* short residence at their present address.

Analysis of length of residence in terms of types of local authority and population size reveals no consistently significant variations. (Table 26).

TABLE 26 (Q.4a)

## Length of residence in "home" area, by type and size of local authority

(Base)	C.B.				M.B./U.D.					R.D.
	Total 751	Con- urba- tion 294	250,000+ 206	60,000- 250,000 251	Total 910	Con- urba- tion 113	60,000- 100,000 235*	30,000- 60,000 288	Up to 30,000 417	Total 538
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Length of residence:										
Up to 3 years	14	12	16	15	16	12	17	17	16	16
Over 3, up to 10 years	21	22	22	19	23	21	29	25	21	23
Over 10, up to 20 years	21	22	24	18	19	21	22	22	16	18
Over 20 years	28	28	24	30	24	27	22	22	25	28
Born here (and continuous residence)	16	16	14	18	18	19	9	14	22	15

\* Including supplementary sample.

A breakdown in terms of age reveals the quite expected positive correlation between increasing years and length of residence. (The likelihood of still living in the area of one's birth, which naturally declines in statistical terms with age, therefore shows a slight correlation with *younger* age):

Table 27 (Q.4a)

## Length of residence in "home" area, by age

(Base)	Age				
	21-34 524	35-44 444	45-54 447	55-64 395	65+ 377
	%	%	%	%	%
Length of residence:					
Up to 3 years	29	16	9	6	12
Over 3, up to 10 years	29	28	20	15	18
Over 10, up to 20 years	14	26	29	16	13
Over 20 years	6	14	27	48	44
Born here (and continuous residence)	21	16	15	15	13

The apparent tip of a known social problem may be visible, incidentally, in the very slight regression toward a *shorter* length of residence shown among the most elderly group, 65+. This may be a reflection of problems associated with tenure of accommodation, family break-up or institutionalisation. It is very possible, alternatively, that this regression arises out of movement as a result of retirement.

Table 28 details an analysis of length of residence in the "home" area in terms of three other factors:

- population stability of the ward/parish in which the elector is living: It is not surprising that growth areas should show a somewhat shorter average length of stay among their residents. In wards/parishes of decreasing



TABLE 28 (Q.4a)  
Length of residence in "home" area

(Base)	Total All informants 2199	Population stability						Socio-economic status						Education		
		Over 2% decrease	Over 1%, up to 2% decrease	Nil change, up to 1%	Up to 1% increase	Over 1%, up to 2% increase	Over 2% increase	Group					Never employed/ others	Higher	Secondary	Lower
		256	335	484	418	278	428	1 97	2 168	3 773	4 477	5 531		129	448	1622
Up to 3 years	15	11	14	12	17	15	22	15	16	18	13	14	12	32	16	14
Over 3, up to 10 years	22	17	19	22	21	25	27	27	23	25	21	19	20	25	31	20
Over 10, up to 20 years	20	16	19	18	25	22	18	27	17	19	21	20	18	17	20	20
Over 20 years	26	30	33	29	23	23	20	15	27	25	26	28	34	15	21	28
Born here	17	26	15	19	13	15	14	15	17	13	19	20	16	11	12	18

population there is conversely a very visibly longer average period of residence;

- socio-economic status: With the exception of Group 2, which contains farmers—not normally regarded as a highly mobile occupation—there is a tendency for a greater proportion of electors of a lower socio-economic status to have lived in their “home” area for over 20 years.
- education: The greater mobility of the more highly educated is very clearly evident in the much shorter average length of residence of this group.

Table 29 analyses informants’ length of residence in their “home” areas by the size of those areas. We have distinguished in this analysis between informants who feel an allegiance to the “home” area defined and those who do not.

We find the expected relationship between longer residence and a larger “home” area; (a more widely defined geographical area clearly permits greater opportunity for mobility *within* it). However, it may be thought that this tendency is not pronounced to any extraordinary degree.

Table 29 also very clearly shows again (see Table 3) the correlation which exists between length of residence and the propensity to be able to conceptualise allegiance to a “home” area. Those electors who are unable to do so are somewhat more recent arrivals in the area, compared with adherents.

*Previous residence:* It has been suggested that just as *length* of residence may have consequences for the degree of involvement of the individual with his or her community, so may—with some limitations—the distance of the person’s previous residence from the community area, prior to his moving to that area. We thus had questions which were able roughly to establish whether electors who had at some time moved into their “home” area, as they defined it, were long-distance or short-distance movers. We have summarised below the results from these questions (Q.4b–Q.4d):

Born here, and continuous residence	17% (364)	17% (364)	Born here, and continuous residence
		6% (126)	Moved from within less than 10 mins. walk away*
Moved, from within local authority area	34% (748)	28% (625)	Moved from more than 10 minutes walk away, but within local authority area
		16% (361)	Moved from outside local authority area but within 10 miles
Moved, from outside local authority area	49% (1080)	32% (703)	Moved from outside local authority area and more than 10 miles away
Don't know/Q.N.A.	*% (7)	1% (20)	Don't know/Q.N.A.
<b>Total:</b>	<b>2199</b>	<b>2199</b>	

\* Includes 3 who moved from outside local authority area.



TABLE 29 (Q.4a)  
Length of residence in "home" area, by size of "home" area

		Informants with a "home" area							Informants without a "home" area				
		Total	"Extended" area	Town/city equiv.	Ward equiv. +	Part of ward	Parish equiv.	Part of parish	Total	"Extended" town or city equiv.	Ward equiv. +	Part of ward	Parish/part of parish
(Base)		1710	110	264	419	570	180	156	484	58	108	199	118
36	Length of residence:	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
	Up to 3 years	13	9	11	11	16	10	17	23	24	17	25	25
	Over 3-10 years	19	15	16	21	21	18	23	33	29	29	34	37
	Over 10-20 years	19	15	16	21	21	17	15	24	12	31	22	25
	Over 20 years	29	26	25	26	29	35	34	16	21	20	17	10
	Born here (and continuous residence)	20	35	32	21	13	20	11	4	14	3	2	3

\* Q.N.A.: 5 informants.

Thus, almost exactly two-thirds of the total sample had moved no very great distance—that is, no more than 10 miles—when they came originally to live in their present “home” area. We should note that this tells us nothing, of course, of any earlier moves which they may have made, nor of the number of moves *within* the “home” area which may have occurred subsequently.

There was no consistent variation in the distance of previous movement in terms of residence, but other variations for certain sub-groups from the overall pattern shown above run true to expectation. The most significant difference relates to type of local authority, wherein we find that generally the more urbanised the area (i.e. the larger the urban settlement) the greater the likelihood of movement into the “home” area having been made from some other part of the same local authority area, with correspondingly lesser chances of the move having been of more than 10 miles distance:

TABLE 30 (Q.4b, 4c, 4d)

Previous residence, by present type of local authority

(Base)	C.B. 751	M.B./U.D. 910	R.D. 538
	%	%	%
% of total moving:			
from within local authority area	56	25	19
from more than 10 miles away	17	36	46

An analysis of migration in terms of informants from three groupings of Registrar General's Standard Regions shows that informants now living in the South-East and East Anglia Regions (excluding Greater London, of course) are somewhat longer-distance movers than those elsewhere. This is no doubt a consequence in part of the general tendency for workers to move towards the south-east of the country. This regional difference is further accentuated if we add the comparative figures relating to the numbers of present residents who were born in their “home” area:

Table 31 (Q. 4a-d)

Previous residence, by R.G. Standard Region

(Base)	North, North-west, Yorks. and Humberside 853	E. and W. Midlands, South-west 725	East Anglia, South-east 621
	%	%	%
Born in “home” area	21	16	11
% of total moving:			
From within local authority area	36	39	25
From more than 10 miles away	25	26	49

Table 32 presents a statistical breakdown of the sample in a form similar to that presented in the chart on page 35. Analyses of previous residence are shown in terms of adherence to the “home” area, socio-economic status and education of the informant.



The major variation between adherents and non-adherents lies in the considerably greater proportion of the former who were born in the "home" area. Excluding from both groups this category of "natives", there is in fact no observable difference of any significance between them in respect of the distance of their previous residence. The greater mobility of the highly-educated (and, therefore, people in the higher socio-economic groups) upon which we have commented is again reflected in the figures in Table 32.

TABLE 32 (Q.4b, 4c, 4d)

Previous residence, by adherence to the "home" area, socio-economic status and education

(Base)	* Informants*		Socio-economic status							Education		
	with "home" area	with- out "home" area	Group					Never employed/ others		Higher	Second- ary	Lower
	1710	484	1	2	3	4	5			129	448	1622
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%		%	%	%
Born here, and continuous residence	20	4	15	17	13	19	20	16		11	11	18
Moved from within less than 10 minutes walk away	6	6	3	3	5	5	8	7		2	4	6
Moved from more than 10 minutes walk away, but within local authority area	27	33	12	22	28	33	31	23		16	21	32
Moved from outside local authority area, but within 10 miles	16	18	17	17	16	19	16	10		20	17	16
Moved from outside local authority area, and more than 10 miles away	30	38	53	41	37	22	24	43		50	46	27
Don't know/ Q.N.A.	1	1	—	—	1	2	1	1		1	1	1

\* Q.N.A.: 5 informants.

#### Reasons for first coming to live in "home" area (Q.5)

Although a wide range of explanations was offered for the elector's original move into the "home" area, two reasons in particular predominated:

accommodation (mentioned by 38% of the total sample); and  
employment (24%)

Omitting all those informants whose "reason" for residence was that of birth, prior residence, or the fact that they came to the area as children, these two

TABLE 33 (Q.5)  
Reasons for first coming to live in "home" area

(Base)	2199
	%
Home area of spouse	9
Informant had lived there previously	*
Informant came as child with parents/guardians	7
Friends already living in the area	2
Relations living in the area	4
Born in the area (whether or not continuous in subsequent residence)	17
Accommodation reasons	38
Employment reasons	24
Health reasons	4
Retirement	3
Informant "liked" the area	5
More amenities/facilities than in previous area	*
Schooling	*
Other reasons	1
Don't know/Q.N.A.	*

predominating factors of accommodation and employment then account for 51 % and 31 % respectively of the total sample.

Although it is hardly surprising to find these two reasons quoted most often, it is striking that little duplication of response (i.e. electors giving more than one reason) was visible. To some extent this may be a purely technical effect, but otherwise it suggests either that contingent considerations (convenience for transport/shopping, physical attractiveness of the area, etc.) have now receded in apparent significance in favour of the main reason for moving *from the previous area*, or that for a large proportion of the population the selection of a place in which to live is heavily affected by factors which relate more to necessity than to choice. As we have already seen, 17 % of the sample had been born in the area they described as the "home" area, and by far the majority of these had resided there continuously ever since, except for periods of temporary absence.

Taking the two most frequently-quoted reasons, accommodation and employment, it may be interesting to see how the proportions quoting each vary within certain sub-groups of the sample:\*

- type of local authority: whilst accommodation is a more frequent reason for movement in the larger urban areas (C.B.'s) than it is to M.B.'s, U.D.'s and R.D.'s, conversely employment is a more frequent explanation in the latter authority areas than it is in the former. We should remember that, given the small average size of the "home" area, prior movement within the C.B.s was often of the across-city variety, and thus had fewer implications for place of employment, which could be maintained from the new address.
- population size: whilst this index is closely related to type of local authority, it is again evident that employment reasons generally assume greater statistical importance among informants living in smaller areas; conversely, in spite of a certain degree of inconsistency, the quotation of reasons

\* Other variations, whilst internally consistent, either fail to reach a satisfactory level of statistical significance, or are merely obvious—such as that a reply of "came as a child with my parents", given the minimum age of our informants, is closely related to length of residence in the "home" area.



TABLE 34 (Q.5)  
Proportions quoting accommodation and employment as reasons for first coming to live in "home" area

		<i>Proportion quoting:</i>	
		<i>Accommodation</i>	<i>Employment</i>
	(Base)	%	%
<i>All informants</i>	(2199)	38	24
<i>Type of local authority:</i>			
C.B.	(751)	47	15
M.B./U.D.	(910)	33	28
R.D.	(538)	34	28
<i>Population size:</i>			
C.B.	Conurbation	48	13
	250,000+	52	13
	60,000-250,000	43	20
M.B./U.D.	Conurbation	34	21
	60,000-100,000	46	27
	30,000-60,000	36	31
	up to 30,000	28	28
<i>Socio-economic status:</i>			
Group 1	(97)	30	40
2	(168)	33	30
3	(773)	39	28
4	(477)	39	18
5	(531)	41	16
Never employed/others	(153)	30	25
<i>Previous residence:</i>			
Born here	(364)	—	—
Moved from within local authority area	(748)	68	11
Moved from outside local authority area, but within 10 miles	(361)	47	27
Moved from outside local authority area, and more than 10 miles	(703)	21	47
Others	(23)		

\* Including supplementary sample.

associated with accommodation on the whole becomes more frequent among electors living in the larger local authorities.

- socio-economic status: employment is very clearly a much stronger reason for movement as socio-economic status increases. To a somewhat lesser extent, reasons associated with accommodation grow proportionally with a decrease in status. While this may be purely a negative reflection of a variation in emphasis, it may alternatively be considered to result from a situation of greater need in respect of housing matters on the part of people in lower socio-economic groups. We should note that the final figure in this section of Table 34 is not an inconsistency: informants may be so categorised according, for example, to the motivation ascribed to other family members. Thus a non-working housewife could move for reasons related to her husband's employment.
- previous residence: as one may have hypothesised, the greater the distance of movement to the present "home" area the more frequent is employment a reason for that movement. Accommodation reasons are quoted considerably more often among the short-distance movers.

(b) *Patterns of kinship and social acquaintance*

On the hypothesis that a strong correlate with involvement in the local community would be the extent to which informants have friends and relatives living in the area, we included a number of questions on this latter subject. The first of these was concerned with the total number of adult people each informant knows (to speak to) in his/her home area (Q.11). We should bear in mind the entirely subjective meaning placed upon informants' understanding of the broad responses with which they were prompted (see Table 35), and the consideration that this particular question was regarded as a potential *indicator* of involvement rather than a producer of precise data in itself. We may nevertheless conclude, from Table 35, that around two-thirds of our sample (69%) regard themselves as being acquainted with a reasonably large number of people in their respective "home" areas:

TABLE 35 (Q.11)

"How many people would you say you know who live in ('home' area)?"

(Base)	2199
<i>Informants knowing:</i>	%
None	1
Only one or two	5
A few	26
Many	32
Very many	36
(Don't know/Q.N.A.)	*

The extent to which a wider acquaintance within the "home" area varies according to a number of characteristics may be shown by Table 36. From this we can see that significantly larger proportions of informants claimed to know "many" or "very many" people among:

- longer-term residents, and especially those who have lived in the "home" area for more than twenty years, some having been born there;
- those who felt a sense of belonging to their home area, compared with those who did not, (not at all surprisingly);
- informants who defined their "home" area more widely in geographical terms. Again, it is to be expected that the larger the area, the greater the number of acquaintances it might encompass;
- and finally informants living in rural areas, especially; and to a lesser extent, those living in smaller urban local authorities.

There is some evidence from Table 36 to suggest also a wider claimed circle of acquaintance among informants of higher socio-economic status, and higher educational attainment, but these differences are somewhat less wide than the more outstanding ones we have noted above.

The second and third indices of kinship and acquaintance were derived from Questions 12a and 12b which ascertained respectively the number of adult relatives and friends living within ten minutes' walk of the informant's home. In toto, replies are summarised in Table 37.

Thus, we may quickly see that

- about half of the sample have no relatives living within this short, ten-minute walking distance;
- nearly three-quarters have no more than two such relatives.



TABLE 36 (Q.11)

Proportion of informants claiming to know "many" or "very many" people in "home" area

(Base)		Proportion claiming to know "many" or "very many" people in the area
<i>All informants</i> (2199)		% 68
<i>Type of local authority:</i>		
C.B.	(751)	63
M.B./U.D.	(910)	70
R.D.	(538)	72
<i>Population size:</i>		
C.B.	Conurbation (294)	67
	250,000+ (206)	60
	60,000-250,000 (251)	60
M.B./U.D.	Conurbation (113)	69
	60,000-100,000 (235)*	69
	30,000-60,000 (288)	68
	Up to 30,000 (417)	73
<i>Socio-economic status:</i>		
Group 1	(97)	74
2	(168)	76
3	(773)	66
4	(477)	69
5	(531)	69
Never employed/others	(153)	62
<i>Education:</i>		
Higher	(129)	72
Secondary	(448)	66
Lower	(1622)	68
<i>Residence:</i>		
Up to 3 years	(336)	43
Over 3-10 years	(491)	57
Over 10-20 years	(435)	66
Over 20 years	(573)	80
Born here	(364)	88
<i>"Home" area size:</i>		
<i>With a "home" area:</i> (1710)		75
"Extended" area	(110)	90
Town/city equivalent	(264)	80
Ward equivalent or larger	(419)	77
Part of ward	(570)	67
Parish	(180)	80
Part of parish	(156)	74
<i>Without a "home" area:</i> (484)		43
"Extended" area	(17)	No. (8)
Town/city equivalent	(41)	59
Ward equivalent or larger	(108)	42
Part of ward	(199)	36
Parish	(56)	61
Part of parish	(62)	44

\* Including supplementary sample.

TABLE 37 (Q.12a, 12b)

**"How many adult relatives and in-laws/how many adult friends live within ten minutes' walk from your home?"**

(Base)	No. of relatives and in-laws (Q.12a) 2199	No. of friends (Q.12b) 2199
	%	%
Nil	49	19
1/2	23	13
3/4	10	11
5/6	6	14
7-10	6	8
11-15	3	12
16-20	1	7
21+	1	15
(Don't know)	—	1

Clearly, friendship exhibits a much more limited spread in terms of this rough geographical index, with over a third of the sample possessing more than ten friends who are resident within the same short span.

The more widely spread nature of relationships among the higher socio-economic groups (together, no doubt, with the geographically more spacious living conditions of such informants) and, by the ever-present correlation, among the more highly educated, is shown in Table 38:

TABLE 38 (Q.12a, 12b)

**Proportion of informants with no relatives or in-laws living within ten minutes' walk, and average number of adult friends, by socio-economic status and education**

(Base)	Socio-economic status						Education		
	1 97	2 168	Group 3 773	4 477	5 531	Never employed/ others 153	Higher 129	Secondary 448	Lower 1622
Proportion with no relatives within 10 minutes' walk	74%	53%	56%	43%	37%	59%	74%	64%	43%
Average no. of adult friends within 10 minutes' walk	10.2	9.7	8.0	9.8	8.4	8.4	9.4	8.7	8.7

Table 38 also shows, however, that while the highest socio-economic status and education groups tend much less than other groups to possess relatives within this "10 minutes" area, no such trend is visible in terms of acquaintance.

A correlation with length of residence in the "home" area is shown both for the proportion of electors who have no relatives living with 10 minutes' walk (i.e. a negative correlation), and for the average number of adult friends living within the same distance (positive):



TABLE 39 (Q.12a, 12b)

Proportion of informants with no relatives or in-laws living within ten minutes' walk, and average number of adult friends, by length of residence in "home" area

(Base)	Length of residence				
	Up to 3 years 336	Over 3- 10 years 491	Over 10- 20 years 435	Over 20 years 573	Born here 364
Proportion with no relatives within 10 minutes walk	71%	62%	53%	41%	21%
Average no. of adult friends within 10 minutes walk	6.6	7.2	8.3	10.4	10.8

It is interesting to speculate, perhaps, why the variation in real terms between the average number of friends achieved at different lengths of residence is not greater; that is, why it does not show a less constant progression. Leaving aside considerations of purely statistical significance which are nevertheless satisfied, the slow and almost exactly linear increase in the number of friends shown for each of the categories in Table 39 means that the accumulation of such acquaintances has by far its greatest momentum in the first couple of years' residence. Thereafter, increments to the number are slow (though "turnover" or substitution may take place), suggesting that, on this index at least, further involvement with the local community—as defined at any rate by a ten-minute walk—is of only marginally greater strength.

Table 40 suggests that informants living in rural areas have fewer relatives within the ten minutes distance; this may well be due once again to the differing pattern of settlement. However, there is less consistency in the comparable analysis of friendship and acquaintance. For example, the average number of friends living within ten minutes' walking distance is highest in the smaller urban authority areas. Informants living in rural local authorities approximate towards the figure for M.B.'s and U.D.'s rather than that for C.B.'s. While electors who live in the most sparsely populated areas are less likely to have relatives close at hand, this same group conversely possesses the highest average number of friends within a ten-minute walking distance. This finding appears somewhat to contradict a suggestion that topography has a limiting effect upon number of friends. We should remember, though, that a very large proportion of the R.D. part of the sample is probably resident in some form of (albeit quite small) urban settlement

TABLE 40 (Q.12a, 12b)

Proportion of informants with no relatives or in-laws living within ten minutes' walk, and average number of adult friends, by type of local authority and population density

(Base)	Type of local authority			Population density (persons per acre)		
	C.B. 751	M.B./U.D. 910	R.D. 538	0-1 307	Over 1-20 1504	Over 20 388
Proportion with no relatives within 10 minutes walk	47%	48%	56%	60%	49%	43%
Average no. of adult friends within 10 minutes walk	7.6	9.6	8.9	9.7	8.9	7.1

—of village or small-town size; it is most unlikely that farm-dwellers or other electors living on entirely free-standing sites should predominate. A further explanation may lie in the presence of secondary factors (such as a combination, for example, of low socio-economic status and high residential transition in the more densely-populated areas).

Table 41 presents analyses of the two indices which we have been discussing, in terms of population size and size of "home" area. It will be seen that apart from the expected variation between informants with and without a feeling of allegiance to the "home" area, no consistently significant differences are thrown up that are not explained by earlier analyses:

TABLE 41 (Q.12a, 12b)

Proportion of informants with no relatives or in-laws living within ten minutes' walk, and the average number of adult friends, by population size and size of "home" area

	(Base)	Proportion with no relatives	Average no. of adult friends
<i>Population size:</i>			
		%	
C.B. { Conurbation	(294)	45	7.8
250,000+	(206)	51	7.7
60,000-250,000	(251)	48	7.3
M.B./U.D. { Conurbation	(113)	43	8.3
60,000-100,000	(235)*	59	9.7
30,000-60,000	(288)	52	8.2
up to 30,000	(417)	43	10.5
<i>Size of "home" area</i>			
<i>With a "home" area:</i>			
"Extended" area	(1710)	45	9.7
Town/city equivalent	(110)	55	12.3
Ward equivalent+	(264)	40	9.3
Part of ward	(419)	43	10.8
Parish equivalent	(570)	46	8.7
Part of parish	(180)	44	9.8
	(156)	51	9.2
<i>Without a "home" area:</i>			
"Extended" area/town, city equivalent	(484)	64	5.4
Ward equivalent+	(58)	59	6.3
Part of ward	(108)	61	5.4
Parish equivalent, or part of parish	(199)	62	4.8
	(118)	74	6.0
Q.N.A.	(5)	—	—

\* Including supplementary sample.

A guide to feelings of involvement with the "home" (community) area may be ascertained not only from the actual number of relatives and friends living near at hand, but from that *proportion* of the total circle of such acquaintances which is to be found resident in the area. Thus, by implication an account is also taken of the existence of relatives and friends *outside* the area, which may negatively affect community involvement. (The use of these various questions purely as indicators of a factor of involvement is discussed later).

The wider distribution of relatives compared with that of friends is shown once again. A more detailed analysis of these overall figures reveals that informants

in lower socio-economic groups,

of a lower level of educational attainment, and in particular

of the greatest length of residence,



TABLE 42 (Q. 13a, 14a)  
Proportion of relatives and friends who live in "home" area

(Base)	Relatives (Q.13a) 2199	Friends (Q.14a) 2199
	%	%
<i>Proportion living in "home" area:</i>		
None of them	44	13
Half or less of them	33	46
Most of them	12	29
All of them	4	10
Informant has none, or only 1 or 2 relatives/friends	7	2
Don't know/Q.N.A.	*	*

tend more frequently to have a larger proportion of their total circles of relatives and friends living within the boundary of their "home" area. Thus, they may be said to possess more clustered community patterns in terms of this particular index than complementary groups.

TABLE 43 (Q.13a, 14a)  
Proportion of informants with most or all their relatives/friends living in "home" area, by socio-economic status, education and length of residence

(Base)	Socio-economic status						Education			Length of residence			
	Group					Never employed/ others	Higher 129	Secondary 448	Lower 1622	Up to 3 years 336	Over 3-10 years 491	Over 10-20 years 435	Over 20 years/ born here 937
	1 97	2 168	3 773	4 477	5 531								
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Most or all relatives	11	14	13	19	21	12	5	11	19	6	7	9	29
Most or all friends	27	34	35	43	43	16	26	32	42	21	29	30	55

Table 44 takes these two indices ("most" or "all" of the informant's circles of relatives and friends) and presents analyses of each in terms of type and size of local authority, and size of "home" area.

#### *Frequency of seeing relatives and friends in the "home" area*

As Table 45 illustrates, there is quite frequent contact between informants\* and their relatives and friends within the "home" area. Eighty-one per cent of this group in fact claim to see relatives at least once a week (most of them far more often than this), and as many as 91 % see friends with a similar frequency. These "very frequent" informants comprise 40 and 77 % respectively of the total sample. This may lead us to conclude, always bearing in mind that we have no knowledge of the nature or intensity of this contact, that friendship appears to assume a larger share of total community interaction than do kinship and formal relationship.

There is some slight evidence to suggest also that frequency of contact with both relations and friends increases, the more the total circle of such acquaintances

\* Those who have at least a few relatives and friends resident in the area.

TABLE 44 (Q.13a, 14a)

Proportion of informants with most or all their relatives/friends living in "home" area, by type and size of local authority and size of "home" area

		<i>Proportion with:</i>		
		<i>Most or all relatives</i>	<i>Most or all friends</i>	
		(Base)		
<i>Type and size of local authority:</i>		%	%	
C.B.	Total	(751)	14	36
	Conurbation	(294)	12	34
	250,000+	(206)	14	37
	60,000-250,000	(251)	18	39
M.B./U.D.	Total	(910)	20	41
	Conurbation	(113)	14	41
	60,000-100,000	(235)*	10	35
	30,000-60,000	(288)	16	37
	Up to 30,000	(417)	25	47
R.D. Total		(538)	14	39
<i>Size of "home" area:</i>				
<i>With a "home" area:</i>		(1710)	19	44
"Extended" area		(110)	28	57
Town/city equivalent		(264)	32	61
Ward equivalent+		(419)	20	44
Part of ward		(570)	13	35
Parish equivalent		(180)	19	52
Part of parish		(156)	8	33
<i>Without a "home" area:</i>		(484)	8	20
"Extended" area/town, city equivalent		(58)	17	38
Ward equivalent+		(108)	8	18
Part of ward		(199)	5	18
Parish equivalent, or part of parish		(118)	8	20
Q.N.A.		(5)		

\* Including supplementary sample.

TABLE 45 (Q.13b, 14b)

Frequency of seeing relatives and friends to speak to in "home" area

<i>Base: (all with more than 1 or 2 relatives/friends in "home" area)</i>	<i>Relatives (Q.13b) 1077</i>	<i>Friends (Q.14b) 1859</i>
	%	%
<i>Frequency</i>		
Almost every day	35	36
2 or 3 times a week	25	34
About once a week	21	21
About once a fortnight	5	5
About once a month	5	2
Less often than once a month	6	2
Never	*	—
(Don't know)	3	*



is concentrated within the "home" area. This is more especially evident in respect of friends.

TABLE 46 (Q.13a, b, 14a, b)  
Frequency of seeing relatives and friends, by the proportion of relatives/friends living in "home" area

In "home" area: (Base)	Relatives (Q.13a, b)			Friends (Q.14a, b)		
	Half or less 717	Most 268	All 92	Half or less 1002	Most 640	All 217
<i>Frequency of seeing</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%
Almost every day	34	35	43	33	38	45
2 or 3 times a week	25	27	18	32	37	32
About once a week	19	26	22	24	19	15
Less often	18	11	16	11	5	8
(Don't know)	4	2	—	*	*	—

We were, finally, asked to investigate—as far as a reported-behaviour question would allow us to—the extent to which informants' friends within the "home" area themselves formed a circle of inter-acquaintance. That is, how many of the individual's own friends also knew each other. Over three-quarters of those electors who *had* friends in the area claimed that most or all of those friends knew each other:

TABLE 47 (Q.14c)  
How many of informant's friends in the "home" area know each other?

Base: (all with friends in "home" area)	1859
	%
None of them	3
Half or less of them	17
Most of them	44
All of them	32
(Don't know)	4

This may be taken as another indication of the fairly heavy concentration of friends within the prescribed area, and it may further be seen as confirming the factor of friendship and acquaintance as a very potent aspect of community structure.

### (c) Employment

Sixty per cent of our total sample were currently undertaking some form of paid employment (Q.15a). This proportion was clearly related primarily to the sex of the informant (men 80%, women 41%), but other variations from this overall figure due almost entirely to secondary factors (such as age, opportunity for employment, and sex again) were evident in analyses by, for example:

— type of local authority

TABLE 48 (Q.15a)  
Employment, by type of local authority

(Base)	C.B. 751	M.B./U.D. 910	R.D. 538
	63%	60%	55%

— socio-economic status

Group 3, which includes female clerical workers, showed a lower-than-average proportion employed (54%),\* while Groups 1 and 4—predominantly male occupations—exhibited somewhat higher figures (70 and 77% respectively).

Some four in ten of all informants interviewed were in a position of employment located within their local authority area (39%). This represents 66% of all employed persons.

Given that the average "home" area is defined as somewhat smaller than a full local authority area, we expectedly find a smaller proportion of the total who are employed within the boundary of their "home" area: 20% of all informants (or 33% of those employed). Thus, for a large proportion of the sample, the place of work has been excluded from a definition of the "home" area. Of this 20%, over a quarter find their occupation *usually* involves their travelling outside the "home" area during the course of their work. (We do not know how much of their work is carried on outside, however.) Thus, no more than 14% of all the electors interviewed (or 23% of all employees) are presently tied entirely to their "home" area in respect of employment.

Table 49 shows for each analytical sub-group, the proportions of informants employed within, respectively, their local authority area and their "home" area. We also show in each case the latter figure adjusted so as to omit those who travel outside the "home" area during the course of work. Figures are additionally included for the proportions of informants who are employed *outside* their local authority area.

Women, rather than men, show a tendency to be employed nearer home, as do informants in the lower educational categories (reflecting very often the nature of their jobs in localised industry). These two groups exhibit a significantly higher than average level of employment both within the local authority and "home" areas.

In terms of socio-economic status, which is itself based upon occupation, we have to consider the *nature* of the work carried on by each group in order to rationalise the variations:

- Group 1, large employers and professional workers: highly mobile, tend to be located in the industrial and commercial areas of an urban environment, they therefore show the weakest likelihood of working both in the local authority and "home" areas in which they reside. Group 2 contains farmers who would tend more often to be resident at their location of work and who, in any case, live in geographically larger local authority and "home" areas; relatively few of them, however, would not travel *outside* the "home" area during the course of their work. Group 3, intermediate non-manual grades, contains a quite large proportion of clerical and administrative workers whose day-to-day work is not of a mobile nature, hence this group exhibits the largest percentage number of all who are in employment "tied" as we have called it, to the "home" area. Group 4, skilled manual workers, not only contains some occupations which by definition involve travelling, but is likely to comprise employment of a more specialised—and not necessarily geographically proximate—nature. Thus, these are somewhat less likely to be employed within the "home"

---

\* The index of socio-economic status used in this report is based upon last job held by the informant him- or herself. (See Appendix A). Thus, Group 3 would expectedly include a number of women who are not presently working, but have been employed at some time in the past.



TABLE 49 (Q.15b, c, d)

## Location of employment

	Total	Sex		Socio-economic status							Education			Type of local authority			Population stability	
		Male	Female	1	2	Group		5	Never employed/ others	No.	Higher	Second-ary	Lower	C.B.	M.B.	U.D. R.D.	Decrease/ up to 1% increase	Over 1% increase
		846	467	77	103	414	367	339	13		81	271	961	471	547	295	872	441
Base: (all employed informants)	1313																	
Employed inside local authority area	66	61	75	36	65	69	64	73	(8)		43	59	70	79	60	55	72	54
Employed outside local authority area	33*	38	24	62	34	30	35	26	(5)		54	40	29	20	39	43	27	44
Employed in "home" area	33	31	38	22	43	39	27	32	(4)		25	31	34	24	36	43	33	33
Employed in "home" area and do not usually travel outside	23	18	33	9	15	31	16	27	(4)		15	18	25	18	25	27	24	22

\* Approximately 1% in each group were classified as D.K. or Q.N.A. for this question.

area they have defined. Group 5, semi-and unskilled workers: the least mobile perhaps of all five groups, is also most likely to be employed within the area of the local authority, but shows no significant concentration within the "home" area.

The analysis by educational attainment of the informant shows, as it does almost entirely throughout the survey, a closely similar pattern of response to the breakdown by socio-economic status: the more highly educated electors are less likely to be employed locally.

While percentage employment within the local authority area rises as one progresses along the continuum through R.D.'s—M.B.'s/U.D.'s—C.B.'s, conversely, percentage employment within the defined "home" area decreases. This is no doubt a consequence of two factors: the limited, neighbourhood definition of "home" area in towns and cities (effectively excluding the industrial and commercial districts of those local authorities) and, in R.D.'s, the slightly more pronounced tendency to live at the location of work.

In local authorities showing somewhat larger-than-average increases in population size there is a significantly lower proportion of workers who find their employment within the area boundary. This may be explained by the suggestion that newer residents retain their employment in the (adjacent) local authority areas from which they have moved. These local authorities of increasing size are, after all, likely to be made up of overspill suburbs and new town developments.

We must therefore point to quite substantial differences between certain sections of the total in the extent to which employment is part either of their "home" community area life, or even is contained within the administrative boundaries of their residence.

We present in Table 50 a further, slightly summarised, analysis of location of employment in terms of population size, and size of "home" area.

#### (d) *Leisure and Other Activities*

(1) *Location of leisure time—amount of time spent in "home" area.* Of four ways\* in which informants could spend the 24 hours in any day (Sunday, Saturday or weekday), we have abstracted one which may be used as an indicator of involvement with the "home" area. It has been included therefore largely with regard to its relevance for the factor analysis, but we report briefly upon it here: the number of hours the elector spends on each of these three types of day outside his/her home but *within* the "home" area as defined for us.

Perhaps, surprisingly, it is on Sundays that we find *least* time spent in the "home" area, as may be seen from Table 51. Nearly two-thirds of our sample claimed to spend no time there at all on Sundays. Saturdays and weekdays show largely similar patterns, with slightly more time spent in the "home" area. There is a small but visible difference between urban and rural environments in these latter cases, however, with R.D. dwellers spending somewhat less time within the defined area than their urban counterparts.

It will be remembered that patterns of leisure activities vary considerably along with seasons of the year. Thus, data obtained during the period of fieldwork

---

\* These were: At work or travelling to and from work;  
Outside the home, but in the "home" area;  
Outside the home, and outside the "home" area;  
and at home (including sleeping and any work at home).



TABLE 50 (Q.15b, c, d)  
Location of employment, by population size and size of "home" area

	Population size				Size of "home" area					
	C.B.		M.B. U.D.		Informants with a "home" area			Informants without a "home" area		
	Conurbation	60,000-250,000	60,000-100,000	100,000-30,000	Local authority area or larger	Parish/ward equiv. or larger	Smaller than parish/ward equiv.	Local authority area or larger	Parish/ward equiv. or larger	Smaller than parish/ward equiv.
Base: (all employed informants)	191	127	153	59	238	379	404	31	95	159
Employed inside local authority area	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Employed inside "home" area	70	89	83	43	66	32	22	48	24	17

\* Including supplementary sample.

TABLE 51 (Q.16)

Amount of time spent in "home" area on last or usual Sunday/Saturday/  
weekday, by type of local authority

(Base)	All informants 2199	Type of local authority		
		C.B. 751	M.B./U.D. 910	R.D. 538
<i>Hours spent in "home" area</i>	%	%	%	%
Sunday: Nil	65	65	65	66
1/2	19	19	18	21
3+	16	16	17	14
Saturday: Nil	55	51	52	65
1/2	25	28	25	21
3+	20	21	23	13
Weekday: Nil	56	55	52	63
1	16	20	14	14
2	13	11	15	11
3	16	14	19	13

(April-July) will not necessarily reflect activities at other times. Their use as a comparative factor, between different segments of our sample, is however unlikely to be affected.

(ii) *Club and society membership.* From Table 53 which details the proportions of our sample belonging to a wide range of different types of club or society, (ascertained in Q.17), it will be seen firstly that 35% belong to none at all. The widest proportionate membership for any of the specific organisations about which we asked was found for:

Trade Unions 20%; and  
Social or sports clubs at work 13%

Table 53 also shows the location of club and society activity among those electors who participate in each type.

An analysis of the *number* of organisations individually belonged to shows the following pattern:

TABLE 52 (Q.17a)

Number of organisations belonged to

(Base)	2199
	%
<i>Belong to:</i>	
No organisations	35
1 organisation	25
2/3 organisations	27
4 or more organisations	13

While 38% of the total sample belonged to at least one club, society or other organisation located within their "home" area, 53% possessed membership of at least one such body within the boundary of their respective local authority areas. (See Table 54).



TABLE 53 (Q.17a)  
Types of clubs and organisations belonged to

	Membership among total sample Base 2199	Location of membership		
		(Base)	In "home" area	In local authority area
	%		%	%
(a) <i>Organisations connected with work:</i>				
Trade Union	20	(435)	23	60
Professional association	6	(135)	18	30
Club to help workmates or colleagues	7	(163)	25	59
Business group or club	2	(34)	41	59
Social or sports club at work	13	(278)	26	59
Any other clubs at work	3	(57)	26	56
(b) <i>Public bodies or committees</i>	2	(40)	70	73
(c) <i>Organisations connected with politics:</i>				
Political party or association	9	(188)	57	78
Any other political group	*	(10)	(6)	(10)
(d) <i>Organisations connected with Education and Training:</i>				
Organisations for further education	3	(61)	39	56
Military training group	1	(24)	33	71
Youth training organisation	2	(40)	70	75
Nursing or first aid organisation	1	(17)	(5)	(12)
Any other	1	(17)	(5)	(12)
(e) <i>Church or other religious group:</i>				
Church club or group	5	(111)	71	91
Social club connected with church	4	(90)	71	90
Any other	2	(50)	52	76
(f) <i>Organisations connected with welfare:</i>				
Charitable organisation	4	(91)	41	55
Voluntary welfare organisation	1	(23)	39	74
Any other	1	(29)	45	62
(g) <i>Civic or community group:</i>				
Tenants' or ratepayers' association	3	(65)	83	92
Parents' association	4	(98)	48	76
Residents' club or community centre	2	(41)	80	90
Any other	1	(13)	(12)	(13)
(h) <i>Other groups connected with leisure activity:</i>				
Sports team or club	9	(207)	55	70
Club for games	7	(149)	53	78
Dance club	2	(48)	44	69
Club for hobbies or pets	2	(52)	52	71
Music, drama, jazz or art club	3	(55)	42	60
Motoring association	7	(147)	7	13
Any other	3	(67)	30	43
(i) <i>Other social clubs:</i>				
Fraternal or ex-servicemen's club	7	(151)	48	64
Women's social club	3	(76)	67	92
Working man's club	9	(190)	56	83
Youth club	1	(31)	68	87
Club for old people	3	(58)	69	97
Any other	4	(81)	49	63
(j) <i>Anything else not covered</i>	3	(57)	53	70
<i>No clubs or groups at all</i>	35			

TABLE 54 (Q.17a, b, c)

Number of organisations belonged to in "home" and local authority area

(Base)	In "home" area 2199	In local authority area 2199
	%	%
<i>Belonging to:</i>		
Nil organisations	62	47
1 organisation	21	26
2/3 organisations	14	21
4+ organisations	4	6

"Home" area membership was slightly lower in C.B.'s than in M.B.'s, U.D.'s and R.D.'s:

TABLE 55 (Q.17b)

Number of organisations belonged to in "home" area, by type of local authority

(Base)	C.B. 751	M.B./U.D. 910	R.D. 538
	%	%	%
<i>In "home" area, belonging to:</i>			
Nil organisations	69	60	57
1 organisation	18	23	23
2/3 organisations	11	14	16
4+ organisations	3	4	4

Table 56 contains analyses of the numbers of organisations belonged to in the "home" and local authority areas in terms of the population size of the informant's local authority area and the size with which he/she had defined the "home" area.

From Table 57 we may conclude that electors in the higher socio-economic and education groups are more likely to be members of (more) clubs in both their respective "home" and local authority areas than are electors in complementary



TABLE 56 (Q.17a, b, c)  
Number of organisations belonged to in "home" and local authority areas, by size of local authority and size of "home" area

Home and local authority areas, by size of local authority areas, by size of local authority areas, by size of local authority areas, by size of local authority areas																
(Base)	Population size							Size of "home" area								
	C.B.			M.B./U.D.				Informants with a "home" area				Informants without a "home" area				
	Conur- bation 294	250,000+ 206	60,000- 250,000 251	Conur- bation 113	60,000- 250,000 235*	30,000- 60,000 288	Up to 30,000 417	Total 1710	Local authority area or larger 374	Ward/ parish equiv. + 599	Smaller than ward/ parish equiv. 726	Total 484	Local authority area or larger 58	Ward/ parish equiv. + 164	Smaller than ward/ parish equiv. 261	
56	Belonging to: In "home" area:	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
	Nil	69	74	65	63	63	57	61	60	43	53	75	72	47	69	78
	1	20	15	17	19	22	24	22	22	26	27	17	17	28	18	13
	2/3	9	9	14	15	12	15	14	14	21	17	8	11	22	12	8
	4 or more	2	2	4	3	3	4	3	4	10	4	1	1	3	1	1
	In local authority area:															
	Nil	51	50	41	50	37	44	49								
	1	24	20	24	26	33	24	28								
	2/3	20	20	25	20	25	25	19								
	4 or more	5	10	10	4	5	7	4								

\* Including supplementary sample.

lower groups. Without doubt this reflects a basically greater frequency of organisation membership (irrespective of location) by the former categories in the first place:

TABLE 57 (Q.17a, b, c)

Number of organisations belonged to in "home" and local authority areas, by socio-economic status and education

(Base)	Socio-economic status						Education		
	1 97	2 168	Group 3 773	4 477	5 531	Never employed/ others 153	Higher 129	Secondary 448	Lower 1622
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<i>Belonging to:</i>									
<i>In "home" area:</i>									
Nil	47	55	63	61	66	70	51	52	66
1	20	22	21	20	21	20	19	25	20
2/3	23	19	13	14	11	8	19	18	12
4 or more	10	4	3	5	2	2	11	5	2
<i>In local authority area:</i>									
Nil	34	46	47	42	52	64	35	39	51
1	27	25	29	21	26	21	24	27	26
2/3	25	25	19	27	17	13	29	25	18
4 or more	14	4	5	10	5	2	12	9	5

(iii) *Entertainment*. A battery of questions was posed on the frequency of visiting certain types of public entertainment and recreation and the location most often visited in each instance. While the selected list of entertainments was considered as reasonably representative of this type of public leisure activity it may in fact be seen from Table 58 that even by a liberal standard only the last two items can effectively be adjudged frequently-indulged pastimes.

TABLE 58 (Q.24a)

Frequency of participation in various types of entertainment and recreational activity

Base: all informants (2199)	Frequency of visiting		
	At least once a month	Less often than once a month	Never
	%	%	%
Cinema	10	40	50
Theatre, concerts or recitals	4	29	67
Football, rugby or cricket matches	17	10	73
Greyhound racetrack	1	1	98
Bingo sessions	12	5	83
Ten-pin bowling	2	6	93
Public dance-hall	4	10	86
(Public) swimming pool	9	8	83
Golf Course	2	2	96
(Public) tennis court	3	1	96
Public park or gardens	36	22	42
Into the countryside (for pleasure/recreation only)	58	20	22

Notwithstanding this generally low frequency of attendance, the location most often visited for each entertainment (in/outside the local authority area, and in/outside the "home" area) was ascertained for informants who ever visit it. A summary for individual activities is contained in Table 59.

The relatively small percentage numbers of electors claiming most often to visit these various entertainment facilities inside their respective "home" areas is a consequence of a number of factors:

- the geographically small average definition of "home" area;
- the siting of many of these public pastimes in a centralised district of the town or city, (i.e. separate from areas of residence);
- and, of course, the low frequency of visiting upon which we have commented above.

TABLE 59 (Q.24a-c)

Most frequent location of entertainments/recreations (in local authority and "home" areas)

<i>Base: all informants (2199)</i>	<i>"Ever" visit</i>	<i>Most often visit in local authority area</i>	<i>Most often visit in "home" area</i>
	%	%	%
Cinema	50	26	10
Theatre, concerts or recitals	33	11	3
Football, rugby, or cricket matches	27	17	8
Greyhound racetrack	2	1	*
Bingo sessions	17	12	8
Ten-pin bowling	7	2	1
Public dance-hall	14	7	3
(Public) swimming-pool	17	9	5
Golf course	4	2	1
(Public) tennis court	5	4	3
Any sort of public park or garden	58	41	24
Into the countryside (for pleasure/recreation only)	78	18	12

With the possible exception of parks and gardens, therefore, we can not at first sight conclude that, taking the electorate as a whole, the "home" area coincides in any way with the pursuit of publicly-indulged entertainment and recreational activities. Given the commercial nature of most of these enterprises and the need rationally to site them in locations of optimum access, this can hardly be surprising.

As a further guide to a more comprehensive assessment of entertainment and recreational location, we show in Table 60 the *number* of such activities (from the list used in this survey) most often carried out, in and outside each type of area.

Viewed negatively, three in ten of the total sample pursue *none* of the twelve types of public entertainment or recreation within the boundary of their local authority area, while more than a half pursue none at all within the "home" area they have defined. To put these two proportions further into perspective, we may conversely note that 77% of the total usually attend at least one form of entertainment outside their respective local authority area, and as many as 86% at least one form outside their "home" area.



TABLE 60 (Q.24a-c)

Number of entertainments/recreations in local authority and "home" areas

<i>Base: all informants (2199)</i>	<i>Local authority area</i>		<i>"Home" area</i>	
	<i>In</i>	<i>Outside</i>	<i>In</i>	<i>Outside</i>
<i>Number of entertainments:</i>	%	%	%	%
Nil	30	23	55	14
1	29	36	26	23
2	20	20	11	22
3/4	17	16	7	30
5/6	4	5	1	9
More than 6	1	1	*	2

The overall figures, in any case, hide a strong variation between informants in urban and rural authority areas, and a clear though lesser one between larger and smaller urban local authorities:

TABLE 61 (Q.24b)

Proportion of informants attending *no* entertainments most often in local authority area, by type of local authority

<i>(Base)</i>	<i>C.B.</i> 751	<i>M.B./U.D.</i> 910	<i>R.D.</i> 538
	17%	27%	52%

Once again, a note to take account of the commercial nature of many of these enterprises will be relevant in explanation of this difference. A small, but noticeable, difference was apparent between adherents and non-adherents to the "home" area in terms of the number of entertainments and recreations they pursue in that area. The former group showed a somewhat higher level of activity:

TABLE 62 (Q.24c)

Number of entertainments visited most often in the "home" area, by adherence to the area

<i>Base:</i>	<i>With "home" area</i> 1710	<i>Without "home" area</i> 484	<i>(Q.N.A.)</i> (5)
<i>No. of entertainments</i>	%	%	
None	52	63	
1	27	25	
2/3	17	10	
4+	4	2	

Not unsurprisingly, there was a close correlation between the size of the "home" area, as defined for us by informants, and the number of entertainment activities carried on within it. For illustration of this, we show in Table 63 the numbers (of adherents) quoting at least one such activity within defined areas of different sizes.

TABLE 63 (Q.24c)

Proportion of informants visiting at least one entertainment in the "home" area, by size of "home" area

Base: (all informants with a "home" area):	Size of "home" area					
	"Extended" area	Town/city equiv.	Ward equiv. or larger	Part of ward	Parish equiv.	Part of parish
	110	264	419	570	180	156
Visiting at least one entertainment in "home" area	79%	81%	54%	31%	34%	27%

(iv) *Attendance at a place of worship.* As many as 43% of the entire sample claimed that they attend a place of worship "these days". Whilst we allowed even infrequent visiting (such as for marriages, christenings, etc.) to be included in our liberal definition of attendance,\* we may nevertheless consider this to be subject to some over-claiming. Nevertheless, analysis of this overall figure in terms of various sub-groups within the sample shows, not unexpectedly, certain evident variations as may be seen from Table 64.

Claims to church attendance were significantly higher among:

- women;
- older informants;
- those in non-manual socio-economic grades;
- the more highly-educated;
- those living in rural areas, as opposed to urban authorities;
- and (only just significant statistically) those who did possess a feeling of belonging to the "home" area.

There was also a very slight correlation between church attendance and increased length of residence in the home area, but this is no doubt a secondary consequence of age.

Table 64 also shows the relevant proportions within each demographic sub-group who attend a place of worship within the boundary of their respective local authority area and their "home" area. In an overall comparison of this with other similar analyses of activity which we have shown, it will be seen first of all that a "home" area. This may well reflect the greater number of churches, chapels and halls which exist and therefore their usually closer situation to people's homes. It further permits us to suggest that, for a fair proportion of attenders at least, a place of worship (in most cases, of course, the parish church) is an active, constituent feature of the home community area. Comparing once again the proportions of each sub-group visiting a place of worship in the local authority and "home" areas respectively, there are no groups for whom this statement might be particularly emphasised; the extent of claims to attendance are reflected fairly consistently in the proportions visiting within each type of area. Thus, for example,

\* Informants had to attend a service to qualify; mere sight-seeing was excluded.

**TABLE 64 (Q.18a-c)**  
**Attendance at place of worship, and location of attendance**

(Base)		Proportion who claim to attend a place of worship	Proportion (of total sample) attending in local authority area in "home" area	
		%	%	%
<i>All informants</i>	(2199)	43	38	28
<i>Sex:</i>				
Male	(1055)	37	32	25
Female	(1174)	47	43	31
<i>Socio-economic status:</i>				
Group 1	(97)	52	43	34
2	(168)	51	44	36
3	(773)	50	44	34
4	(477)	30	26	19
5	(531)	37	34	24
Never employed/other	(153)	47	43	30
<i>Education:</i>				
Higher	(129)	60	50	42
Secondary	(448)	53	47	36
Lower	(1622)	38	34	25
<i>Age:</i>				
21-34	(524)	37	32	25
35-54	(891)	43	38	29
55+	(772)	46	41	30
(Q.N.A.)	(12)			
<i>Q.2:</i>				
Informants with a "home" area	(1710)	44	39	31
Informants without a "home" area (Q.N.A.)	(484) (5)	39	33	20
<i>Length of residence:</i>				
Up to 3 years	(336)	38	33	23
Over 3-10 years	(491)	43	37	24
Over 10-20 years	(435)	42	38	27
Over 20 years/born here	(937)	44	40	33
<i>Type of local authority:</i>				
C.B.	(751)	37	34	25
M.B./U.D.	(910)	41	36	25
R.D.	(538)	53	46	38
<i>Population size:</i>				
C.B. { Conurbation	(294)	43	38	28
250,000+	(206)	28	24	18
60,000-250,000	(251)	40	37	28
M.B./U.D. { Conurbation	(113)	49	45	36
60,000-100,000	(235)*	47	43	24
30,000-60,000	(288)	41	36	25
Up to 30,000	(417)	37	33	24

\* Including supplementary sample.

just as more R.D. residents claim to attend a place of worship than is found among urban authority electors, so this group also displays a larger proportion who go to church within the respective local authority and "home" areas.



(v) *Use of a "local" public house.* By means of a couple of filter questions, we were able to establish whether each informant has (at least) one "local" to which he may go for a drink. Over the total sample, 30% replied that they have. As can be seen from Table 65, this percentage figure was significantly higher for:

men,  
younger informants,  
informants of lower socio-economic status and education.

The figure was higher among electors living in rural districts than among those in the other types of authority area.

Among informants with a local public house to which they usually go, the percentage numbers within each demographic sub-group whose "local" is located within the "home" area were again generally in line with the respective proportions claiming to have a "local" in the first place. The two exceptions to this were:

informants without a "home" area to which they felt a sense of belonging—while showing a similar potentiality to have a "local"—were somewhat less likely to have one in the "home" area which they had nevertheless described.

informants of longest residence in the "home" area (over 20 years) were somewhat *more* likely to think of a local public house within that defined area than others.

(vi) *Ownership and use of a motor vehicle.* The hypothesis was suggested by, among other sources, the qualitative study carried out prior to this survey,\* that the opportunity for increased mobility afforded by the availability of a car or other private vehicle may have a negative consequence for community involvement. We therefore included questions to ascertain whether informants had a vehicle at their general disposal (whether they actually owned it or not) and how frequently they used it to travel outside the home area. In this section of the report we merely present the results obtained from these questions. It will be seen later that although some negative relationship was established between frequency of using a car to travel *outside* the "home" area and informant's score on one of the factor scales describing community involvement, this question was not by any means one of the most useful indicators of community feeling (or, more correctly, lack of it).

Well over half the sample replied in the affirmative as to their ownership or availability of a vehicle (56%). There were considerable variations from the average figure, however, for many specific groups within the total, as can be seen from Table 66. The widest extent of ownership occurred among:

men,  
younger informants,  
electors resident in rural areas (R.D.'s),  
informants in the higher socio-economic groups,  
electors living in areas (wards) of greatest population increase,  
and those living furthest from the arbitrary centre (town hall or main offices) of their respective local authorities.

Replies to the question on the frequency with which informants with a car at their disposal use it to travel outside the "home" area have been scored so as to produce

---

\* See Appendix C to this report.

TABLE 65 (Q.19b, d, e)

## Visiting a "local" public house, and location of it

	(Base)	Proportion with a "local"	Proportion (of total sample) with a "local"		
			in local authority area	in "home" area	
		%	%	%	
All informants	(2199)	30	25	19	
Sex:					
Male	(1055)	39	33	26	
Female	(1174)	23	19	14	
Age:					
21-34	(524)	41	32	24	
35-44	(444)	36	30	23	
45-54	(447)	30	23	18	
55-64	(395)	23	21	18	
65+	(377)	18	17	14	
(Q.N.A.)	(12)				
Socio-economic status:					
Group 1	(97)	27	20	15	
2	(168)	29	24	20	
3	(773)	23	18	13	
4	(477)	40	34	29	
5	(531)	37	33	24	
Never employed/others	(153)	16	14	11	
Education:					
Higher	(129)	25	18	13	
Secondary	(448)	25	19	16	
Lower	(1622)	32	28	21	
Q.2:					
Informants with a "home" area	(1710)	30	26	21	
Informants without a "home" area	(484)	31	24	15	
(Q.N.A.)	(5)				
Length of residence:					
Up to 3 years	(336)	31	25	17	
Over 3-10 years	(491)	29	23	17	
Over 10-20 years	(435)	31	25	17	
Over 20 years/born here	(937)	31	27	23	
Type of local authority:					
C.B.	(751)	29	25	19	
M.B./U.D.	(910)	29	23	18	
R.D.	(538)	34	29	24	
Population size:					
C.B.	Conurbation	(294)	34	29	23
	250,000+	(206)	27	25	16
	60,000-250,000	(251)	24	20	16
M.B./U.D.	Conurbation	(113)	32	23	21
	60,000-100,000	(235)*	30	26	20
	30,000-60,000	(288)	27	22	17
	Up to 30,000	(417)	31	25	19

\* Including supplementary sample.

TABLE 66 (Q.21a, b)

Access to a motor vehicle, and frequency of use outside the "home" area

	(Base)	Proportion with access to a motor vehicle	Frequency score for use outside "home" area
<i>All informants</i>	(2199)	% 56	9.9
<i>Sex:</i>			
Male	(1055)	61	11.4
Female	(1144)	53	8.5
<i>Age:</i>			
21-34	(524)	69	13.0
35-44	(444)	67	12.1
45-54	(447)	62	10.6
55-64	(395)	50	8.1
65+	(377)	28	3.9
Q.N.A.	(12)		
<i>Socio-economic status:</i>			
Group 1	(97)	86	16.9
2	(168)	83	16.3
3	(773)	60	10.0
4	(477)	60	11.3
5	(531)	38	5.9
Never employed/others	(153)	46	7.4
<i>Type of local authority:</i>			
C.B.	(751)	50	9.1
M.B./U.D.	(910)	56	9.2
R.D.	(538)	67	12.1
<i>Population size:</i>			
C.B. { Conurbation	(294)	44	8.4
250,000+	(206)	55	9.4
60,000-250,000	(251)	53	9.7
M.B./U.D. { Conurbation	(113)	55	8.9
60,000-100,000	(235)*	54	9.1
30,000-60,000	(288)	65	11.3
Up to 30,000	(417)	49	7.9
<i>Population stability:</i>			
Decrease/nil change	(1075)	48	8.3
Increase	(1124)	65	11.4
<i>Distance from centre of local authority (town hall):</i>			
Up to $\frac{1}{4}$ mile	(114)	42	6.0
Over $\frac{1}{4}$ -1 mile	(608)	51	8.7
Over 1 mile-2 miles	(582)	56	9.8
Over 2 miles	(869)	63	11.4
<i>Q.2:</i>			
Informants with a "home" area	(1710)	56	9.1
Informants without a "home" area	(484)	58	11.5
Q.N.A.	(5)		

\* Including supplementary sample.



a more easily comprehensible enumerative analysis.\* These average scores are also shown in Table 66, and exhibit a very similar pattern to the above. It is theoretically possible to halve these average scores in order to obtain estimates as to the number of days per month upon which the vehicle is used to travel outside the "home" area. We should advise considerable caution, however, in accepting these estimates too precisely in view of their basis in entirely general and subjectively-defined claims.

(vii) *Ownership of a telephone* (Q.22). A similar hypothesis to that underlying the questions employed in the last section suggested the availability of a telephone (in spite of its known regional and social-class bias) as a further negative indicator of community involvement. That is, persons who possessed the facility of a telephone at home might be less strongly involved with local ties as a result of the external contact which it permits. It will be seen later, in Section G, that this hypothesis is to some extent substantiated even though there is no significant correlation, at any rate, with expressed adherence to the "home" area. For interest we show below the proportions within the total sample and within certain sub-sections of it which have access to a telephone in their homes.

TABLE 67 (Q.22)  
Proportion with access to a telephone at home

<i>All Informants</i> (2199)			28%		
	(Base)	%		(Base)	%
<i>Sex:</i>			<i>R.G. revised Standard Region:</i>		
Male	(1055)	30	North	(224)	13
Female	(1144)	27	North West	(333)	21
			Yorks. and Humberside	(296)	21
<i>Age:</i>			East Midlands	(235)	25
21-34	(524)	25	West Midlands	(281)	28
35-44	(444)	31	East Anglia	(82)	16
45-54	(447)	31	South East	(539)	46
55-64	(395)	30	South West	(209)	29
65+	(377)	25			
(Q.N.A.)	(12)		<i>Type of local authority:</i>		
<i>Socio-economic status:</i>			C.B.	(751)	20
Group 1	(97)	80	M.B./U.D.	(910)	30
2	(168)	66	R.D.	(538)	36
3	(773)	34			
4	(477)	15	<i>Q.2:</i>		
5	(531)	11	Informants with a		
Never employed/others	(153)	27	"home" area	(1710)	28
			Informants without a		
			"home" area	(484)	29

#### (e) *Readership of Local Newspapers*

A local newspaper is, without doubt, one of the main sources of information for local news and events and, therefore, readership of the local press may be a good indicator of people's interest in the community around them. When

\* Scores were assigned as follows:

Almost every day	40
2-3 times a week	24
About once a week	8
About once a fortnight	4
About once a month	2
Less often than once a month	1
Never/Don't know/Q.N.A./No access to a vehicle	0

commenting on the results it should, however, be remembered that although high levels of readership may be indicative of interest in the local area, a low level may only be a function of the lack of a suitable local newspaper.

Informants were asked whether they read any local newspapers regularly, this being defined as two out of the last three issues. The data have been analysed by type of local authority area and population size within each type. The summary in Table 68 shows that a very large proportion (87%) of the total sample reads *at least one* local newspaper of some type (morning, evening, Sunday, weekly or monthly).

TABLE 68 (Q.9a-e)

Regular readership of local newspapers, by type and size of local authority

(Base)	All informants 2199	C.B.				M.B./U.D.					R.D. Total 538
		Total 751	Conur- bation 294	250,000+ 206	60,000- 250,000 251	Total 910	Conur- bation 113	60,000- 100,000 235*	30,000- 60,000 288	Up to 30,000 417	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Regularly read at least 1 local newspaper	87	85	85	82	86	88	88	81	90	88	86
Regularly read 2 or more local newspapers	36	26	31	18	25	41	53	30	40	39	41

\* Including supplementary sample.

No consistent significant difference is attributable to the analysis by type of local authority. However, readership is slightly lower in the larger (non-conurbation) urban authorities. This finding may well be attributed to the factor of availability of papers in the towns and cities which constitute these groups.

As would be expected from the structure of the local newspaper industry, readership of the local press is confined mainly to evening and to weekly or monthly papers:

TABLE 69 (Q.9b-e)

Proportion of informants who regularly read each type of local newspaper

Base (all informants)	2199
	%
Morning	10
Evening	50
Sunday	3
Weekly/fortnightly/monthly	55

(Adds to more than 100% due to multiple response).

Local *daily* newspapers are found to be weak in all types of area, presumably because of competition from the national press. Readership is heaviest in the R.D.'s, and lightest in the C.B.'s (60-250,000) and the M.B./U.D.'s (60,000+). Local *evenings* tend to mirror the readership levels of the dailies, being particularly strong in the larger urban areas and weakest in the smaller M.B./U.D.'s and the rural districts. *Weekly and less frequently* published newspapers are read



more widely in the smaller urban authority areas and the R.D.'s. Local *Sunday* newspapers, of course, are rarely to be found and are therefore not at all frequently mentioned.

A finer indicator of local interest may be provided by the *number* of newspapers that are read. One newspaper seen regularly may be no more than a desire to know about the times or availability of local entertainments etc., but readership of two or more *may* be indicative of a much deeper interest in local affairs. We therefore show in Table 70 figures relating to the number of local newspapers individually read:

Table 70 (Q.9a-e)  
Number of local newspapers read regularly (1)

Base (all informants)	2199
	%
None	13
One	51
Two	28
Three	7
Four or more	1

The present survey therefore showed 36% of the total claiming to read more than one local paper. An analysis of these "multiple" readers in terms of area-type and size shows that they tend to comprise particularly higher proportions in rural districts and M.B.'s/U.D.'s (especially those located within conurbations). They are much less frequently found in county boroughs, especially C.B.'s outside conurbation areas; (see Table 68).

Further analyses of the number of local newspapers read regularly are shown in Table 71. The differences shown are rather too marginal to permit us full confidence in a conclusive generalisation; however, it appears that readership of 2 or more newspapers is higher among informants with a claimed adherence to the "home" area (compared with those without such allegiance), and that multiple readership increases along with higher education. There is no consistent significant difference between the various socio-economic groups, although multiple readership is highest among electors in Group 2 (small employers and farmers). We shall see later that multiple readership of local newspapers is related quite strongly to *one* of the two forms of community involvement identified.

TABLE 71 (Q.9 a-e)  
Number of local newspapers read regularly (2)

	Q.2 Informants*		Socio-economic status						Education		
	with a "home" area	without a "home" area	Group					Never employed/ others	Higher	Second-ary	Lower
(Base)	1710	484	1	2	3	4	5		129	448	1622
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
None	12	17	10	8	13	14	15	16	12	10	14
One	51	52	52	48	51	50	51	56	44	52	51
Two	28	27	26	33	29	29	26	24	33	29	28
Three	7	4	11	9	6	6	7	4	10	8	6
Four or more	2	—	1	2	1	1	1	—	1	1	1

\* Q.N.A.: 5 informants.



(f) *Schooling*

Three in every ten electors interviewed had children (up to 18 years of age inclusive) presently undertaking full-time education.

- 1 % had children at nursery school,
- 21 % had children at primary school,
- 14 % had children at secondary school, and
- 3 % had children at some other type of school.

Informants with school-age children were asked the location of the school or each of the schools currently attended by their children—and we were able to establish therefore the numbers of informants with children at school in and outside the local authority and “home” areas respectively. Whether a child is at school in or outside the local authority is apparently affected by the type of local authority itself:

TABLE 72 (Q.20a-d)

Proportion of informants with children at school in local authority and “home” areas, by type of local authority (i)

<i>Base (all with children at school):</i>	<i>Total</i> 664	<i>Type of local authority</i>		
		<i>C.B.</i> 223	<i>M.B./U.D.</i> 266	<i>R.D.</i> 175
<i>Proportion with a child or children at school:</i>	%	%	%	%
In local authority area	86	95	87	73
Outside local authority area	17	5	13	39
In “home” area	61	69	64	49
Outside “home” area	46	40	42	58

Thus, R.D. residents are somewhat more likely to (have to) send their children to school outside the local authority area—presumably into the nearest town, which may constitute an urban authority in its own right.\* Similarly, bearing in mind that what we are most frequently comparing is a parish-equivalent (or less) with a ward-equivalent (or less), electors from rural districts are visibly less likely than their urban counterparts to have their children at school within the boundary of the “home” area which they described.

The figures in Table 72 are, of course, based properly upon the respective numbers of electors who have school-age children. To place in closer perspective the contribution which may be made to community involvement by the fact of having children at school in the local authority and “home” areas, we show in Table 73 an analysis based upon the total sample.

Thus, around a quarter of all electors have a child at school within their local authority area, and very approximately one in five have a child undertaking full-time education within the “home” area they have described.

\* We should remember that very often a “nearest town” of this nature is physically situated within and perhaps completely surrounded by a rural district. Thus, electors living in the latter authority area may not in any way conceive it as an anachronism to send their children into what is technically a different authority area; the urban district may be in actual fact a focal centre for the surrounding region (in terms of other activities also, such as shopping and entertainment for example).

TABLE 73 (Q.20a-d)

Proportion of informants with children at school in local authority and "home" areas, by type of local authority (ii)

<i>Base (all informants):</i>	<i>Total</i> 2199	<i>Type of local authority</i>		
		<i>C.B.</i> 751	<i>M.B./U.D.</i> 910	<i>R.D.</i> 538
<i>Proportion with child or children at school in:</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
Local authority area	26	28	25	24
"Home" area	18	20	19	16

Table 74 illustrates two analyses of particular interest. Informants with a higher level of education themselves tend slightly to send their children to more distant schools. This may well be a reflection in part of:

the use of private education,

residential and boarding-school education, (especially at the secondary stage) a higher level of education for their children, attending grammar schools away from their immediate home district.

Informants who felt a sense of belonging to their "home" area were slightly, though quite evidently, more likely to have children at school within that area, than were those with no such feelings.

TABLE 74 (Q.20a-d)

Proportion of informants with children at school in local authority and "home" areas, by education and by adherence to the area

<i>Base (all with children at school):</i>	<i>Education of informant</i>			<i>Q.2</i>	
	<i>Higher</i> 42	<i>Secondary</i> 143	<i>Lower</i> 479	<i>Informants with a "home" area</i> 492	<i>Informants without a "home" area</i> 163
<i>Proportion with a child or children at school in</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
Local authority area	81	83	88	Not applicable	
"Home" area	52	57	63		
				64	53

Finally, a clear correlation was shown between the index of density of population in the ward within which the informant resided and the proclivity to have children at school within both the immediate local authority area and "home" area. Thus, with the curious exception only of the most thickly populated wards, there was an increasing tendency towards localisation of schooling as density of population grew. (See Table 75).

Table 76 shows that, in addition to parents in R.D.'s, the group with a lower proportion of children at school within the boundary of their local authority area is found in conurbation M.B.'s and U.D.'s. This result may be explained by the educational "pull" of the county borough(s) which often constitute foci in relation to the more peripheral M.B.'s and U.D.'s in such regions. We would also call attention, however, to the very small base numbers involved in this analysis.



TABLE 75 (Q.20a-d)

Proportion of informants with children at school in local authority and "home" areas, by population density

Base (all with children at school):	Persons per acre					
	0-1 95	Over 1 to 5 155	Over 5 to 10 109	Over 10 to 15 114	Over 15 to 20 79	Over 20 112
Proportion with a child or children at school in	%	%	%	%	%	%
Local authority area	70	85	87	89	91	94
"Home" area	49	57	58	60	81	68

TABLE 76 (Q.20a-d)

Proportion of informants with children at school in local authority and "home" areas, by population size

Base (all with children at school):	C.B.			M.B./U.D.			
	Conur- bation 103	250,000+ 54	60,000- 250,000 66	Conur- bation 36	60,000- 100,000 81*	30,000- 60,000 82	Up to 30,000 117
Proportion with a child or children at school in	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Local authority area	93	98	95	78	93	84	93
"Home" area	63	74	70	71	65	54	71

\* Including supplementary sample.

### (g) Shopping

Nearly six in ten informants (59%) stated that, for food and household goods, they or their families have at least one fairly large shopping "expedition" each week. The most outstanding variations from this overall figure occurred in terms of an analysis by age; younger informants (by implication, with younger spouses and families) were very evidently more likely to concentrate such shopping in one weekly "expedition", rather than spread it over the week, or have it delivered to their homes:

TABLE 77 (Q.23a)

Patterns of shopping behaviour, by age

(Base)	21-34 524	35-44 444	45-54 447	55-64 395	65+ 377	(Q.N.A.) 12
At least one "expedition" per week	% 70	% 68	% 55	% 52	% 44	No. (7)
Shopping spread over the week	24	26	37	37	41	(3)
Deliveries made to home	6	6	7	11	15	(2)
(Q.N.A.)	*	—	1	—	—	(—)



The propensity to have a main shopping journey was also higher among informants living in more rural areas and in areas of greater population growth:

TABLE 78 (Q.23a)

Proportion of informants making a main shopping "expedition"

	(Base)	%
<i>Persons per acre:</i>		
Up to 5	(824)	60
Over 5-15	(745)	61
Over 15	(630)	54
<i>Type of local authority:</i>		
R.D.	(538)	62
C.B./M.B./U.D.	(1661)	58
<i>Population stability:</i>		
Decrease/nil change/up to 1 % increase p.a.	(1493)	57
Over 1 % increase p.a.	(706)	64

Informants living a greater distance from the centre of their respective local authority areas (over 3 miles), tended slightly more often to have home-delivered shopping facilities. (Informants in this group, it will be noted, are mostly R.D. residents):

TABLE 79 (Q.23a)

Patterns of shopping behaviour, by distance from town hall

(Base)	Up to 1 mile 722	Over 1 mile to 3 miles 888	Over 3 miles 563	(Q.N.A.) (26)
At least one "expedition" per week	56	61	58	
Shopping spread over the week	36	32	29	
Deliveries made to home	8	7	13	

Table 80 illustrates the extent to which various sections of the sample have different propensities (or opportunities) to carry out their main weekly shopping journey within the two types of area with which we continue to be concerned, the local authority area and the "home" area. The most outstanding variation is that between informants in urban and rural areas, this being evident in the analysis both by authority type and density of population. Whereas 52% of informants in urban authority areas make the weekly shopping "expedition" within their respective local authority areas, only 22% of rural district residents do so. Furthermore, in the R.D.'s again an exactly similar proportion, 22%, also undertake that enterprise within their "home" area. For all practical purposes, these may be regarded as the same group of people. Conversely, we might express this finding by the statement that among all the electors from rural districts, 40% undertake (or their families undertake) a major weekly shopping journey for food and household items *outside* the area constituted by their local authority. Looked at in this way, the comparable proportion for residents in county boroughs is only 4%, and for those in M.B.'s and U.D.'s, 7%.

These figures only confirm and give substance to the already-established hypothesis that, for major family shopping enterprises, there is a tendency for people to move focally towards towns and central shopping districts. Movement

TABLE 80 (Q.23b, c)  
Location of main weekly shopping "expedition"

	(Base)	Proportion (of total sample) having a main weekly shopping "expedition"	
		in local authority area	in "home" area
		%	%
<i>All informants</i>	(2199)	44	28
<i>Age:</i>			
21-34	(524)	51	35
35-44	(444)	52	33
45-54	(447)	40	22
55-64	(395)	40	24
65+	(377)	35	21
Q.N.A.	(12)		
<i>Socio-economic status:</i>			
Group 1	(97)	36	23
2	(168)	40	25
3	(773)	42	26
4	(477)	50	30
5	(531)	48	30
Never employed/others	(153)	35	24
<i>Distance from town hall:</i>			
Up to ½ mile	(114)	47	38
Over ½ mile-2 miles	(1190)	50	29
Over 2 miles-3 miles	(306)	44	20
Over 3 miles	(563)	31	25
Q.N.A.	(26)		
<i>Type of local authority:</i>			
C.B.	(751)	54	30
M.B./U.D.	(910)	50	29
R.D.	(538)	22	22
<i>Population size:</i>			
C.B. { Conurbation	(294)	49	30
250,000+	(206)	56	27
60,000-250,000	(251)	58	32
M.B./U.D. { Conurbation	(113)	50	35
60,000-100,000	(235)*	53	25
30,000-60,000	(288)	54	28
Up to 30,000	(417)	48	31
<i>Population density (persons per acre):</i>			
0-1	(307)	17	19
Over 1-5	(517)	39	26
Over 5-10	(365)	55	29
Over 10-15	(380)	54	31
Over 15-20	(242)	49	25
Over 20	(388)	50	33
<i>Q.2:</i>			
Informants with a "home" area	(1710)		28
Informants without a "home" area	(484)		25
Q.N.A.	(5)		

\* Including supplementary sample.

within towns and cities is emphasised most vividly perhaps by an alternative analysis of the number making the major shopping expedition within their "home" area in terms of the distance of their residence from the arbitrary centre of the local authority area (the town hall), which may be taken in most cases to be sited close to the central shopping area\*:

TABLE 81 (Q.23b, c)  
Location of main weekly shopping "expedition", by distance from town hall

Base: all undertaking a weekly shopping "expedition":	Distance from town hall					
	up to $\frac{1}{4}$ mile	Over $\frac{1}{4}$ mile to $\frac{1}{2}$ mile	Over $\frac{1}{2}$ mile to 1 mile	Over 1 mile to $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles	Over $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles to 2 miles	Over 2 miles to 3 miles
	59	125	221	152	202	183
Proportion making the "expedition" within "home" area	%	%	%	%	%	%
	73	54	49	51	45	34
Proportion making the "expedition" within local authority area	90	89	84	87	81	74

(h) *Participation in local government activities and local public service*

From the "Local Government Elector" survey carried out for the Maud Committee, which dealt far more comprehensively with the subject of individual participation in local government, we derived a very short series of questions (see Table 82) which enables us to classify informants simply as participators or not in council affairs. We also went on to ascertain whether they had ever held any positions or sat on committees in any kind of public service of a local nature. For each of these activities, where positive, we recorded their area location—on the informant's local council (or elsewhere) in the case of the former, and in or outside the "home" area in respect of the latter.

As may be seen in a later section of this report, we found that one of two factors of community involvement isolated by a special analysis is particularly concerned with these two indices, among others. We would point out that they constitute only one type of involvement, though obviously an important one.

Table 82 shows, as did the earlier "Local Government Elector" survey, how few people can be regarded as involved at all in voluntary participation in council affairs even by the fairly loose standards we have set here. No more than 5.7% can be so classified. About three-quarters of these (4.5% of the total sample) had been concerned with council affairs in their present local authority area.

Table 83 summarises variations from this overall figure of 5.7% among specific sub-groups. It will be seen that participation is evidently wider among:

- men;
- older electors, and residents of longer standing in the area (as a consequence obviously of the lengthier time-opportunity which both groups have);

\* Informants living more than 3 miles from the main council offices have been omitted; these are largely R.D. electors and therefore show a slightly different pattern since so many shop outside their local authority area.



TABLE 82 (Q.32b-e)  
Participation in local government

Base (all informants):		2199
		%
(Q.32b)		
Ever stood for election as a local councillor or as a parish councillor		1.5
(on local council*	1.1 %)	
(Q.32c)		
Ever seriously thought about standing for election but not gone ahead with it		3.6
(on local council*	2.8 %)	
(Q.32d)		
Ever been co-opted to a council committee		0.6
(on local council*	0.3 %)	
(Q.32e)		
Ever been asked to stand for a local or parish council but turned it down		2.9
(on local council*	2.1 %)	
(Q.32b-e)		
Affirmative reply to any one of above questions		5.7
(on local council only	4.1 %)	
(on local and other local authority council	0.5 %)	
(on other local authority council only	1.0 %)	
(Q.N.A.	0.2 %)	

- informants in the two upper socio-economic groups, 1 and 2, which comprise employers, professional workers, farmers and senior managerial occupations;
- informants living in authority areas of smaller population size, with those in rural districts most evidently showing participation. To some extent this is again a reflection of opportunity, not only in terms of the smaller numbers in toto from which council-participants (the term is used in its broad sense as defined by all four indices of participation) may be recruited, but also of the further inclusion of parish (and county) council seats and candidatures in which interest may be shown.
- informants both of "higher" and "secondary" educational levels compared with the greater majority of informants who are classified as "lower" on this index. In fact, those in the "secondary" category show a marginally wider extent of claimed participation in council affairs than do electors on the higher level of education.

For interest, the table also shows the percentage numbers within each group who have participated in council affairs specifically within their present local authority council area.

On the second index of interest in public affairs of a local nature, that of public service, some 9 % of the total sample claimed to have held a position or committee membership of this type. Five per cent had done so within the self-defined boundary of their "home" area. Table 84 similarly itemises variations from these overall figures in terms of specific sections of the sample. It will be apparent that generally a like pattern emerges, with

men,

older electors and longer residents (though with less consistency),

\* Informants were also included here if referring to representation of (part of) the local authority area on the county council.

TABLE 83 (Q.32b-f)

## Participation in local government, and on local council

(Base)		Proportion giving any affirmative answer at Q.32 b-e	Proportion participating on local local authority council Q.32 f
		%	%
<i>All informants</i> (2199)		5.7	4.6
<i>Sex:</i>			
Men	(1055)	9.5	8.0
Women	(1144)	2.3	1.4
<i>Age:</i>			
21-34	(524)	3.1	2.5
35-44	(444)	4.5	3.4
45-54	(447)	6.9	6.0
55-64	(395)	7.4	6.1
65+	(377)	7.4	5.3
(Q.N.A.)	(12)		
<i>Socio-economic status:</i>			
Group 1	(97)	24.8	22.7
2	(168)	14.3	8.3
3	(773)	3.9	2.9
4	(477)	6.3	5.9
5	(531)	2.4	2.1
Never employed/others	(153)	3.3	2.0
<i>Length of residence:</i>			
Up to 3 years	(336)	2.7	1.5
Over 3-10 years	(491)	5.3	4.3
Over 10-20 years	(435)	5.5	4.6
Over 20 years/born here	(937)	7.2	5.8
<i>Education:</i>			
Higher	(129)	10.1	7.8
Secondary	(448)	12.5	9.4
Lower	(1622)	3.5	3.0
<i>Type of local authority and population size:</i>			
C.B.	Conurbation (294)	2.7	2.4
	Over 250,000 (206)	2.9	2.4
	60,000-250,000 (251)	4.8	4.0
M.B./U.D.	Conurbation (113)	4.4	3.5
	60,000-100,000 (235)*	3.8	1.7
	30,000-60,000 (288)	5.2	3.8
	Up to 30,000 (417)	5.8	5.0
R.D.	(538)	9.9	7.4

\* Including supplementary sample.

informants in the two upper socio-economic groups, electors in smaller urban authority areas and, more especially, rural districts,

sharing the widest experience of involvement in public service of a local nature. The most outstanding variation, however, is to be found in respect of the informant's level of education. Over a quarter of all those electors classified as "higher"

had undertaken local public service, compared with 15% of those in the "secondary" category and just 6% of those of a "lower" educational level.

With the exception only—and understandably—of length of residence, the percentage numbers within each sub-group undertaking public service in the "home" area were largely in line with the overall claims, though on a numerically smaller scale:

TABLE 84 (Q.33a, b)  
Participation in local public service

(Base)		Proportion claiming participation in local public service	Proportion claiming participation in "home" area
		%	%
<i>All informants</i> (2199)		9	5
<i>Sex:</i>			
Men	(1055)	11	6
Women	(1144)	7	4
<i>Age:</i>			
21-34	(524)	4	2
35-44	(444)	8	5
45-54	(447)	11	8
55-64	(395)	8	4
65+	(377)	14	7
(Q.N.A.)	(12)		
<i>Socio-economic status:</i>			
Group 1	(97)	27	15
2	(168)	21	11
3	(773)	9	4
4	(477)	6	5
5	(531)	4	2
Never employed/others	(153)	10	5
<i>Length of residence:</i>			
Up to 3 years	(336)	7	1
Over 3-10 years	(491)	9	4
Over 10-20 years	(435)	10	5
Over 20 years/born here	(937)	9	7
<i>Education:</i>			
Higher	(129)	26	13
Secondary	(448)	15	8
Lower	(1622)	6	3
<i>Type of local authority and population size:</i>			
C.B.	Conurbation	(294)	5
	Over 250,000	(206)	5
	60,000-250,000	(251)	7
M.B./U.D.	Conurbation	(113)	6
	60,000-100,000	(235)*	10
	30,000-60,000	(288)	10
	Up to 30,000	(417)	8
R.D.		(538)	14

\* Including supplementary sample.



For interest, it may be noted that 41 % of those electors who had taken any active interest at all in local council positions claimed also to have participated in local public service. The comparable proportion among non-council informants was only 7 %. However, viewed conversely, only just over a quarter of those in public service (27 %) in fact affirmed to any of the questions upon local council activity.

(i) *Rates payment*

Putting community involvement at its lowest, most passive, level, we asked just one question as to whether informants, or other members of their household pay local rates at all (Q.37). The aspect of "involvement" in which we might be interested here was concern with the administration of the local authority area and with the maintenance of general amenities. The hypothesis could be advanced that individual concern might be enhanced by the knowledge that one was making a financial contribution for such purposes.

As far as the limitations inherent in the form of a reported-behaviour question would allow, what we have measured is the proportion of households which pay local rates, rather than the proportion of electors who do so. Even viewed in this way, the figure relating to households must be accepted with some caution since our sample was designed to be representative of electors, not of households. (Thus, technically, larger households will be slightly over-represented in our sample).

With these inhibiting considerations in mind we present with little further comment the finding that claims to the payment of rates were made, on behalf of themselves or their households, by nine out of every ten electors interviewed:

TABLE 85 (Q.37)

"Do you (or household) pay local rates at all, as far as you know?"

(Base)	2199
	%
Pay rates	90
Do not pay rates	9
Don't know/Q.N.A.	1

Given the magnitude of this percentage figure, it follows that this factor, the payment of rates, will have little discriminatory ability for analysis purposes. It also has the effect that few variations of importance are evident among specific sub-groups of the sample. The most outstanding difference was shown in an analysis by socio-economic status of the informant. A slightly inconsistent pattern illustrates overall the expected smaller number among the lower social grades:

TABLE 86 (Q.37)

Payment of local rates, by socio-economic status

(Base)	1	2	Group 3	4	5	Never employed/ others
	97	168	773	477	531	153
% claiming to pay local rates	96%	93%	90%	93%	84%	88%

There was no outstanding variation in the extent of rates payment by the type of local authority in which informants are resident.

(j) *Summary of activities*

In this section of the report, we have investigated a large and varied number of indices of community behaviour. For many of these we have presented data, where applicable, on the extent to which a range of social activities is pursued within the boundaries of the informant's respective local authority area, and within the area self-defined as that in which he/she either feels "at home", or alternatively has described as a "home" area.

Table 87 summarises these data for ten indices. It shows the numbers (a) within the total sample and (b) expressed as a percentage of all those undertaking

TABLE 87  
Location of activities (Summary)

(Base)	In "home" area			In local authority area		
	% of total sample 2199	% of "participants" (see below)		% of total sample 2199	% of "participants" (see below)	
Employment	20	(1313)	33	39	(1313)	66
Spend at least some leisure time in "home" area:						
on Sundays	35	} Not applicable		Not asked		
on Saturdays	45					
on weekdays	44					
Club membership:		(1435)		(1435)		
1 organisation	21		32	26		39
2/3 organisations	14		20	21		31
4+ organisations	4		5	6		9
Entertainment/recreation. Usually visit:						
Cinema	10	(1101)	19	26	(1011)	53
Theatre, concerts, recitals	3	(724)	8	11	(724)	32
Football, rugby, cricket matches	8	(597)	31	17	(597)	61
Greyhound racetrack	*	(47)	11	1	(47)	34
Bingo sessions	8	(368)	46	12	(368)	73
Ten-pin bowling	1	(158)	17	2	(158)	35
Public dance-hall	3	(317)	25	7	(317)	53
Swimming-pool	5	(380)	26	9	(380)	53
Golf course	1	(98)	31	2	(98)	53
Tennis court	3	(99)	56	4	(99)	73
Public park or garden	24	(1286)	41	41	(1286)	70
Into the countryside	12	(1706)	15	18	(1706)	23
Attendance at place of worship	28	(936)	66	38	(936)	89
Visit a "local" public house	19	(667)	65	25	(667)	83
Have child(ren) at school	18	(664)	61	26	(664)	86
Major household shopping journey	28	(1293)	47	44	(1293)	75
Participation in council affairs of local authority	Not asked			5	Not applicable	
Participation in local public service	5	Not applicable		Not asked		

the particular activity at all ("participators"), who may be regarded as pursuing those different activities within the two definitions of area.

Real importance will of course be found in the actual numbers in each case, but we would make a general note that these figures are affected by two basic factors:

- (i) that for a substantial majority of the sample, the definition of the "home" community area was made in terms of a smaller—and often considerably smaller—size than that of a local authority area. (As we have seen, it was frequently described as of an extent equivalent to a ward/parish or polling district). Thus, by implication, it logically follows that the location of fewer activities will be found within the smaller area;
- (ii) that—as we have remarked earlier—a number of the social activities we studied presuppose commercial interests in their provision and in any case a certain rationality of location in terms of optimum access. Thus they are likely to be sited in central and often non-residential areas of towns and cities. The definitions of the "home" area rarely seem to have been made so as to comprise such districts. Indeed, it is an interesting and important finding in itself that this enquiry appears to suggest that conceptualisation of the community area has relatively little to do with these activities (especially the "commercial" ones), and much more to do with fundamental "states of life"—such as kinship, friendship and interests.

Bearing in mind these observations, it is not surprising to find that the activities which are most often pursued within the "home" area are those which are of a fundamentally local nature; that is, their *catchment area* is geographically of a neighbourhood-cum-district size. From Table 87 we can see that these are (taking a minimum of one in three of all "participators" in each case):

attendance at a place of worship,  
visiting a "local" public-house,  
(children's) attendance at school,  
belonging to at least one club or organisation,  
visiting a public tennis court,  
making the main weekly household shopping journey,  
going to bingo sessions,  
visiting a public park or garden,  
and undertaking employment.\*

These items are isolated quantitatively. We should be wary of assuming as a result that they possess, in themselves, a more qualitative importance as contributory factors in making for a sense of community involvement. Nevertheless, we may safely conclude that, of the list of pursuits comprised within this survey, these are the ones which most appropriately characterise the sorts of leisure patterns and other social activities of a "home" area, as it has been defined.

With a mind to our comments above concerning the average size of the "home" area, a merely superficial comparison between the extent or number of social activities carried on respectively in the "home" and local authority areas becomes a little less than meaningful. To present these two sets of data in more valid relationship, we might point to an alternative form of comparison. Taking the

---

\* Clearly the pattern of area recruitment for employment varies considerably, according to the type of work involved. Much employment, however, is evidently carried on within close proximity to the home.



eighteen items\* in the summary table for which we know the proportions of participating electors who pursue them in the two types of area, we may state firstly that, on average, the percentage figure "in home area" is 0.57 of that "in local authority area". Alternatively, we could express this in the form: only 75% more people (who go in for these sorts of leisure and other activities) usually undertake them within the local authority area as do so within the "home" community area. But we have seen that—although an absolutely precise "average" definition is clearly impossible to state—the local authority area is, for a very wide section of the sample, many times larger geographically-speaking than the "home" area. The clustering of activities within the home area, *vis-à-vis* the local authority area at least, therefore becomes more apparent.

This view of the data does not, of course, take into consideration activities which are carried on at a location even further away, outside the local authority area altogether. Certain items indeed are for the most part pursued in precisely this way—trips into the countryside, visits to the theatre, concerts or recitals, visits to a greyhound racetrack or ten-pin bowling are the most obvious examples. To some extent, therefore, when no more than half of all participators in any particular activity pursue it within the boundary of their respective local authority area—whatever the reason for this may be—we may conclude that such activities begin to make little contribution to the social life of the community based upon it; indeed we may even hypothesise that the extent to which they are carried on outside the area has a *detractive* effect upon community life in that area.† We might very reasonably assume, particularly in respect of any more frequently indulged pastimes and activities, that pursuit of these outside the local authority area lessens the amount of time spent within it, increases ties of familiarity at the very least, and possibly identification, with the external area, creates however marginally or superficially a feeling of social dependence upon that outside area, and diminishes the feeling of involvement with the residential authority area.

The importance of this should not be overdrawn, however, though it is very reasonable to suppose that if the pursuit of social activities becomes a less significant aspect of "home" community life, then the more passive aspects of it, kinship and acquaintance etc. are likely to assume greater contributory importance. The factor analysis which we have carried out and upon which we comment later in this report indicates that this may be so.

### Summary

1. Just over four in ten informants (41%) would be "very sorry" to leave the "home" area which they define, and a further 24% "quite sorry" to do so. Proclivity to reply in this way is greater among elderly informants and those resident longest in the area (over 20 years)—these two factors themselves being related.

2. The degree of interest in what goes on in the "home" area is greater particularly among informants of a higher socio-economic status.

3. As length of residence in the "home" area seems to promote attachment and belonging to that area, we should note that 62% of our informants have in fact lived in the defined "home" area for more than ten years, and 44% of them for more than twenty years. Some two-thirds of the total sample had either lived in the "home" area for the whole of their lives or had moved to it from no more than ten miles away. The greater mobility of the more highly educated is shown in the

\* Club membership has been counted as one item only—the proportion in at least one club.

† Of course, an alternative hypothesis is equally valid, and not necessarily contradictory to this: that individual electors who are highly active outside their respective local authority and "home" areas are also more active (than other electors) *within* those areas.

much shorter average length of residence of this group compared with electors of a lower educational attainment.

4. The main reasons given for migration to the area are connected with accommodation and employment, the latter reason assuming far more importance among informants in higher socio-economic grades.

5. The factors of kinship and acquaintance appear to be very potent aspects of community structure; more so than the pattern of general leisure activities.

Around two-thirds of our informants regard themselves as acquainted with a reasonably large number of people in their respective "home" areas. Length of residence in the area affects positively the number of people whom informants claim to know.

We may conclude that friendship exhibits a much more limited spread, geographically-speaking, than does relationship. Just over a half of all informants have adult relatives and/or in-laws living within ten minutes' walk of their home. Eighty per cent of them have friends living within the same distance, while over a third of the sample possess more than ten friends within this short span. Informants in lower socio-economic grades have more closely clustered patterns of relationship and friendship, as have those with a lower level of education.

6. Approximately four in ten of all informants are employed within their own local authority area; this represents 66% of all employed persons. Given the somewhat smaller average size of the "home" area (compared with the local authority area), we also find a smaller proportion of the total sample, 20%, is employed within the "home" area, (33% of all employed persons). Since some also usually travel outside the area in the course of their work, only 14% of all electors may be said to be employed *entirely* within their "home" area. This figure was considerably higher, however, for female employees, and informants in socio-economic groups 3 and 5, intermediate non-manual workers and semi- and unskilled workers. (Group 3 is in fact made up predominantly of females).

7. We studied a range of different leisure and other social activities in which persons may participate within or outside their community area.

Of the activities which we studied, those which are most often pursued in the "home" area (by electors who do participate in them in the first place) and which most appropriately characterise the sorts of social activities of a "home" area as it has been defined, are:

attendance at a place of worship (66% of "participants" usually attend in their "home" area),

visiting a local public-house (65%),

(children's) attendance at school (61%),

belonging to at least one club or organisation (58%),

visiting a public tennis court (56%),

making the main weekly household shopping journey (47%),

going to bingo sessions (46%),

visiting a public park or garden (41%),

and undertaking employment (33%).

The extent to which this range of activities is carried on within the *local authority area* may be illustrated by the following summary, showing the proportion of "participants" in each instance:

80% belong to at least one club or organisation in the local authority area;

53% usually visit a cinema in the local authority area,



- 32% theatre, concerts or recitals,
- 61% football, rugby or cricket matches,
- 34% a greyhound racetrack,
- 73% bingo sessions,
- 35% ten-pin bowling,
- 53% a public dance-hall,
- 53% a swimming pool,
- 53% a golf-course,
- 73% a public tennis court,
- 70% a public park or garden,
- 23% for trips into the countryside.
- 89% attend a place of worship in the local authority area;
- 83% visit a "local" public-house in the local authority area;
- 86% have children attending school in the local authority area;
- 75% undertake the main weekly shopping journey in the local authority area.

With only one or two specific exceptions, we can not conclude that the "home" area coincides in any significant way with the pursuit of public entertainment and recreational activities. Given the relatively small size of the "home" area as defined and the need rationally to site the facilities for many of these activities in locations of optimum access to a wider population, this may not be very surprising.

8. Well over half the sample either own a motor vehicle or have one available for their use.

9. Twenty-eight per cent of all informants have full access to a private telephone in their homes.

10. Eighty-seven per cent of the sample reads at least one local newspaper, most frequently an evening or weekly journal.

11. Six per cent of the sample may be defined as interested in elective participation in local government. Roughly four-fifths of these have been interested in respect of the council of their present local authority area. The figure of 6% is considerably exceeded by men (9.5%), informants in the two highest socio-economic grades (25% and 14% respectively), those with higher or secondary levels of education (10% and 12.5%), and residents in Rural Districts (10%).

12. Some 9% of electors claim to have held a position or committee membership in public service of a local nature, and 5% within the defined boundary of their "home" area. Once again, those with a higher level of education were most frequently involved in this sort of local activity—over a quarter of this group claimed to participate in public service.



## SECTION C

### KNOWLEDGE OF, AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS, LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES

#### Introduction

In this section of the report, we investigate electors' knowledge of local government and their attitudes towards the provision locally of various public services. Our main purpose in including a measure of knowledge was not simply to confirm the findings of a number of earlier research studies (which had pointed to a low level of correct awareness on the part of the general public), but rather to provide a categorisation of informants in terms of which analysis of other areas of the survey might be made.

In addition, the questions on knowledge of the responsibility for local services were designed as a filter to a wider series of questions investigating attitudes on the subject. In this latter respect, we were concerned especially to ascertain whether there were any recognisable differences between electors' attitudes towards services provided by (a) the local authority, (b) the central government, and (c) other statutory bodies. To this end, we employed a selected list which included examples of all three types of service.

Underlying this area of our study is the more general purpose of attempting to see whether—in the mind of the electorate—it appears to make any difference that a service should be administered by a democratically-elected body, as distinct from a Ministry or other statutory agency.

#### 1. Knowledge

The list of services used to obtain an index of knowledge is shown in Table 88. The form of question employed read as follows:

(Q.25a) "And now I'd like to come on to some questions about various public services in the local community. Take *education and schools* first of all; in this area (by that I mean the . . . C.B./M.B./U.D./R.D.), do you think they are mainly the responsibility of . . .?"

A prompt card was then shown, listing alternative answers. The question was repeated for all the other selected services.

Before commenting upon the findings from these questions, we should make two points:

(a) Within an overall technical limitation as to the number of services which could be covered, an attempt was made to include some—administered, as we have noted, by a Ministry or statutory agencies—which might provide a fair comparison with those strictly the responsibility of local government authorities. Hospitals, social security, and electricity supply were therefore chosen for this reason.

We should note also that the somewhat varied pattern of responsibilities which presently exists with regard to a number of these items renders the technique not entirely satisfactory as a reliable index of knowledge. Shared responsibilities between certain bodies and changes in responsibility further make for a less definitive guide.

TABLE 88 (Q.25a-1)

## Believed responsibility for selected local and other public services by type of local authority

(Base)	C.B. 751	M.B./U.D. 910	R.D. 538
	%	%	%
(i) <i>Education and Schools:</i>			
The Government . . . . .	20	14	15
The County Council . . . . .	—	52	51
The Local Council (as relevant C.B., M.B., U.D. or R.D.) . . . . .	66	23	13
The Parish Council . . . . .	—	—	6
Other body . . . . .	3	1	2
Don't know/Q.N.A. . . . .	13	10	14
(ii) <i>Hospitals:</i>			
The Government . . . . .	41	33	34
The County Council . . . . .	—	31	30
The Local Council (as relevant C.B., M.B., U.D. or R.D.) . . . . .	34	11	9
The Parish Council . . . . .	—	—	1
Other body* . . . . .	11	14	10
Don't know/Q.N.A. . . . .	14	12	18
(iii) <i>Libraries:</i>		Group 1 458	Group 2† 452
The Government . . . . .	6	1	3
The County Council . . . . .	—	65	65
The Local Council (as relevant C.B., M.B., U.D. or R.D.) . . . . .	84	35	16
The Parish Council . . . . .	—	—	4
Other body . . . . .	1	1	4
Don't know/Q.N.A. . . . .	9	5	9
(iv) <i>Social Security:</i>			
The Government . . . . .	73	65	62
The County Council . . . . .	—	11	11
The Local Council (as relevant C.B., M.B., U.D. or R.D.) . . . . .	15	12	5
The Parish Council . . . . .	—	—	1
Other body . . . . .	1	2	3
Don't know/Q.N.A. . . . .	11	10	18
(v) <i>Refuse Collection and Disposal:</i>			
The Government . . . . .	3	1	1
The County Council . . . . .	—	9	20
The Local Council (as relevant C.B., M.B., U.D. or R.D.) . . . . .	94	87	72
The Parish Council . . . . .	—	—	4
Other body . . . . .	1	1	—
Don't know/Q.N.A. . . . .	2	3	2
(vi) <i>Recreational facilities:</i>			
The Government . . . . .	3	1	2
The County Council . . . . .	—	11	25
The Local Council (as relevant C.B., M.B., U.D. or R.D.) . . . . .	93	82	34
The Parish Council . . . . .	—	—	18
Other body . . . . .	—	2	9
Don't know/Q.N.A. . . . .	3	4	14
(vii) <i>Electricity Supply:</i>			
The Government . . . . .	35	30	24
The County Council . . . . .	—	16	13
The Local Council (as relevant C.B., M.B., U.D. or R.D.) . . . . .	29	11	13
The Parish Council . . . . .	—	—	1
Other body‡ . . . . .	24	32	39
Don't know/Q.N.A. . . . .	12	11	10
(viii) <i>Town Planning:</i>			
The Government . . . . .	16	11	16
The County Council . . . . .	—	32	41
The Local Council (as relevant C.B., M.B., U.D. or R.D.) . . . . .	75	49	28
The Parish Council . . . . .	—	—	3
Other body . . . . .	2	2	3
Don't know/Q.N.A. . . . .	8	8	12
(ix) <i>Provision of Housing:</i>			
The Government . . . . .	16	9	10
The County Council . . . . .	—	13	30
The Local Council (as relevant C.B., M.B., U.D. or R.D.) . . . . .	78	71	47
The Parish Council . . . . .	—	—	4
Other body . . . . .	3	2	4
Don't know/Q.N.A. . . . .	3	5	8

\* Quotation of a regional hospital board would be a possible correct answer.

† M.B.'s and U.D.'s in Group 2 provide their own library services. Those in Group 1 do not.

‡ Quotation of a regional electricity board would be a possible correct answer.

- (b) The prompt cards differed for interviews conducted in the three types of local authority.\* There can be no doubt that this differential stimulus (in the number of alternative answers) had some effect upon informants' apparent levels of knowledge, as measured by the number of "correct" answers which they gave. This factor should therefore be borne in mind in the interpretation of the results.

Notwithstanding these limitations, it is clear that an approximate, but fairly practical index of knowledge could be derived from these questions (on the basis of the number of correct answers out of the possible total of nine services). This index has been used as an instrument of analysis of many other parts of the survey.

Let us now look at responses to each individual service in turn. These are contained in Table 88 in which we have indicated with a box the "correct" answers. We would comment that in practically all cases the level of correct knowledge appears, against the experience of similar research in the past, to be quite high. As we have pointed out, this is without doubt the result of technical considerations. The range of scores (see Table 89) would almost certainly have been wider if no prompt card had been used.

Generally speaking, there was some confusion over the assigning of responsibility for hospitals and electricity supply; there was more unanimity of opinion over responsibility for social security—though even here, less than two-thirds of electors living in smaller urban authority areas and rural districts, were actually able to assign this correctly to the central Government. On the whole, the proportions of electors correctly assigning local authority-administered services to their respective councils fell somewhere in between those for correct assignment of the two other types.

What may perhaps be of more interest is a summary of the knowledge contained in all these answers, as shown in the number of correct responses given. We present in Table 89 the average number of correct answers out of nine for a number of specific groups within the sample. Greater knowledge of local government services is shown among:

men,  
younger and middle-aged informants (compared with those over 55),  
electors, particularly, in the highest socio-economic group,  
those with a higher level of education,  
and (apparently) those living in county boroughs;  
in turn, electors resident in other urban authority areas were apparently more knowledgeable than rural district electors. This variation is almost

---

\* In county borough interviews, the list read:

The Government  
The County Borough Council

In non-county borough interviews:

The Government  
The County Council  
The Local Council

In rural district interviews:

The Government  
The County Council  
The Rural District Council  
The Parish Council

Informants were permitted to answer "some other body, not on this list", but were not prompted to do so.



TABLE 89 (Q.25a-i)

## Knowledge of responsibility for local provision of public services

	(Base)	Average no. of correct answers
<i>All informants</i>	(2199)	5.4
<i>Sex:</i>		
Male	(1055)	5.7
Female	(1144)	5.0
<i>Age:</i>		
21-34	(524)	5.5
35-44	(444)	5.7
45-54	(447)	5.6
55-64	(395)	5.2
65+	(377)	4.7
Q.N.A.	(12)	
<i>Socio-economic status:</i>		
Group 1	(97)	6.4
2	(168)	5.6
3	(773)	5.3
4	(477)	5.7
5	(531)	5.1
Never employed/others	(153)	4.7
<i>Education:</i>		
Higher	(129)	5.9
Secondary	(448)	5.5
Lower	(1622)	5.3
<i>Length of residence:</i>		
Up to 3 years	(336)	5.2
Over 3-10 years	(491)	5.4
Over 10-20 years	(435)	5.5
Over 20 years/born here	(937)	5.3
<i>Type and size of local authority:</i>		
C.B.	{ Conurbation (294) 250,000+ (206) 60,000-250,000 (251)	{ 6.3 6.3 6.6 } 6.4
M.B./U.D.	{ Conurbation (113) 60,000-100,000 (235)* 30,000-60,000 (288) Up to 30,000 (417)	{ 5.6 4.9 5.2 5.1 } 5.2
R.D.	(538)	4.3
<i>Q.2:</i>		
Informants with a "home" area	(1710)	5.4
Informants without a "home" area	(484)	5.3
Q.N.A.	(5)	

certainly a function solely of the possible number of authorities with service responsibilities in the three different types of authority, with a consequently greater opportunity for informants to be wrong.

It will be seen that there was no statistically significant variation between "home" area adherents and non-adherents in their knowledge of local government on this index.

Since fieldwork was carried out around the time of the local elections, in April and May 1967, it was thought desirable to ascertain as far as possible whether this had had any effect upon informants' awareness of local government services. The only control measure we could include within the form of the survey itself, was an analysis by the timing of individual interviews, before or after the respective polling day, (or on it). This analysis suggests that this factor had no significant effect upon replies:

TABLE 90 (Q.25a-i)

Knowledge of local government responsibility for the provision of services, by date of interview

	(Base)	Average no. of correct answers
<i>Interviews conducted:</i>		
before local election	(1172)	5.4
on the day	(69)	5.2
after local election	(958)	5.3

## 2. Attitudes towards the local provision of public services

Showing informants a list of the services and amenities included in the questions upon knowledge of responsibility, but pointing out that they might alternatively mention any others not on it, we asked whether there were any services which they considered "quite well" run in their own local authority area. We also asked if there were any which they thought not very well run in that area. In each instance, we ascertained which services were referred to.

### (i) Favourable attitudes

Nearly three-quarters of the sample (73%) mentioned at least one public service or amenity which they thought to be quite well run in their respective local authority area. There were some variations from this overall proportion among informants from different authority sizes:

TABLE 91 (Q.26a)

"Are there any of these services, or any others, which are quite well run in this local authority area?" by type and size of local authority

(Base)	C.B.				M.B./U.D.					R.D.
	Total 751	Conur- bation 294	250,000+ 206	60,000- 250,000 251	Total 910	Conur- bation 113	60,000- 100,000 235*	30,000- 60,000 288	Up to 30,000 417	Total 538
% mentioning at least one service as quite well run	74%	71%	76%	76%	73%	68%	68%	77%	71%	71%

\* Including supplementary sample.

but these differences were not entirely consistent, especially when compared to the most obvious variation, which related to the index of knowledge of local government services. Clearly, the more knowledgeable informants were much more favourably inclined to mention at least one service for which they thought praise was due. (See Table 92).

Table 93 shows that there is some association between a favourable inclination to mention at least one service and higher socio-economic status, as well as a higher or secondary level of education.

TABLE 92 (Q.26a)

"Are there any of these services, or any others, which are quite well run in this local authority area?" by knowledge of local government

No. of correct answers: (Base)	"Low" ← "High"					
	Less than 3	3/4	5	6	7	8/9
	166	517	409	450	385	272
% mentioning at least one service as quite well run	46%	69%	73%	73%	81%	83%

TABLE 93 (Q.26a)

"Are there any of these services, or any others, which are quite well run in this local authority area?" by socio-economic status and education

(Base)	Socio-economic status						Education		
	1	2	Group 3	4	5	Never employed/ others	Higher	Secondary	Lower
	97	168	773	477	531	153	129	448	1622
% mentioning at least one service as well run	80%	79%	75%	72%	71%	58%	78%	78%	71%

The particular services which were quoted favourably cover a wide range, but four in particular stand out as being mentioned more frequently. These are refuse collection and disposal, education and schools, libraries and hospitals. All were mentioned by around three in ten of the electors interviewed. Only one of the five most frequently quoted services is not the responsibility of a local government authority (hospitals). The other four are variously the responsibility of first- or second-tier authorities according to the type of local authority area concerned. The full list is shown in Table 94.

TABLE 94 (Q.26b)

Services mentioned as "quite well" run in informants' local authority areas

(Base)	(2199)
Refuse collection and disposal	31%
Education and schools	30
Libraries	30
Hospitals	29
Recreational facilities	18
Electricity supply	13
Provision of housing	10
Social security	6
Town planning	5
Transport	1
Welfare	1
Others	1
Don't know/Q.N.A.	2

(Percentages add to more than 100 due to multiple response).



TABLE 95 (Q.26b)  
Services quoted as "quite well" run, by type and size of local authority

(Base)	C.B.				M.B./U.D.					R.D.
	Total 751	Conurbation 294	250,000+ 206	60,000- 250,000 251	Total 910	Conurbation 113	60,000- 100,000 235*	30,000- 60,000 288	Up to 30,000 417	Total 538
<i>Proportion of informants quoting:</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Refuse collection and disposal	28	25	28	33	28	17	32	33	29	36
Education and schools	30	26	33	34	28	26	21	31	30	32
Libraries	28	21	29	35	33	32	32	39	29	29
Hospitals	33	24	43	36	25	17	24	25	27	28
Recreational facilities	25	18	26	32	19	14	11	25	17	6
Electricity supply	11	14	5	14	11	12	12	14	11	18
Provision of housing	12	10	7	18	10	4	10	10	11	9
Social security	8	6	8	11	5	4	3	5	7	4
Town planning	7	5	5	10	6	7	5	8	4	2
Transport	2	2	1	4	1	—	2	*	1	1
Welfare	1	1	—	1	1	—	1	1	2	1
Others	1	3	*	*	2	2	3	1	2	1
Don't know/Q.N.A.	2	3	1	2	2	—	—	2	2	2

\* Including supplementary sample.

An analysis of replies to this question reveals the following particular points of interest:

- in county boroughs there is a general tendency for more frequent quotation of various services (particularly recreational facilities, education, hospitals and libraries) to be made in *non-conurbation* than in *conurbation* boroughs, indicating a slightly higher level of satisfaction in the former local authorities. To some extent this difference is visible also in M.B.'s and U.D.'s. (See Table 95). Taking the five most frequently-quoted services, we may therefore show—among urban electors—the proportions mentioning each of these within *conurbation* and *non-conurbation* local authorities:

TABLE 96 (Q.26b)

Main services mentioned as "quite well" run, by *conurbation/non-conurbation* local authority areas

(Base)	C.B./M.B./U.D.	
	Conurbation local authorities 407	Non-conurbation local authorities 1254
Proportion of informants quoting:	%	%
Refuse collection and disposal	23	31
Education and schools	26	31
Libraries	24	33
Hospitals	22	31
Recreational facilities	17	23

- quotation in particular of recreational facilities varies considerably between the three main types of local authority:

TABLE 97 (Q.26b)

Proportion of informants quoting recreational facilities as "quite well" run, by type of local authority

(Base)	C.B. 751	M.B./U.D. 910	R.D. 538
	28%	19%	6%

- both refuse collection and supply of electricity are more frequently mentioned among rural authority electors than among those in urban local authorities. It will be remembered that R.D. councils have comparatively fewer functions; refuse collection is, nevertheless, one of these. In respect of electricity, we would hazard the opinion that the variation to a certain extent reflects gratitude for the provision of an amenity which is largely taken for granted in an urban environment. (Table 98)
- electors with higher scores on the index of knowledge of local government more frequently quote certain services in favourable terms than do those with lower scores. Services in respect of which this is particularly true are shown in Table 99.

TABLE 98 (Q.26b)

Proportions of informants quoting refuse collection and disposal, and electricity supply as "quite well" run, by urban/rural authorities

(Base)	C.B./M.B./U.D. 1661	R.D. 538
Refuse collection and disposal	% 28	% 36
Electricity supply	11	18

TABLE 99 (Q.26b)

Miscellaneous services quoted as "quite well" run, by knowledge of local government

(Base)	Informants with:	
	"high" scores (7+) 657	"low" scores (6 or less) 1542
Recreational facilities	% 25	% 15
Provision of housing	15	8
Libraries	38	27
Hospitals	35	26
Education and schools	35	28
Refuse collection	35	28

(ii) *Unfavourable attitudes*

Although 73% of the sample were able to think of at least one local public service which in their opinion is quite well run, just over a half (51%) were also able conversely to quote a service with which they could find fault.

Judged from this standpoint, dissatisfaction was wider among:

- informants from M.B.'s, U.D.'s and R.D.'s than among those from county boroughs,
- informants in particular in conurbation municipal boroughs and urban districts. Seventy-three per cent of these could think of at least one local public service which they considered not very well run, (though note the small base number here):

TABLE 100 (Q.27a)

"Are there any of these services, or any others, which are not very well run in this local authority area?", by type and size of local authority

(Base)	C.B.				M.B./U.D.					R.D. Total 538
	Total 751	Conur- bation 294	250,000+ 206	60,000- 250,000 251	Total 910	Conur- bation 113	60,000- 100,000 235*	30,000- 60,000 288	Up to 30,000 417	
% mentioning at least one service as not very well run	46%	50%	47%	42%	54%	73%	55%	51%	52%	53%

\* Including supplementary sample.



- informants living in wards and parishes of greatest population change (of either an increasing or decreasing nature):

TABLE 101 (Q.27a)

"Are there any of these services, or any others, which are not very well run in this local authority area?", by population stability

	<i>Over 2% decrease</i>	<i>Over 1%-2% decrease</i>	<i>Nil change/ up to 1% decrease</i>	<i>Up to 1% increase</i>	<i>Over 1%-2% increase</i>	<i>Over 2% increase</i>
(Base)	256	335	484	418	278	428
% mentioning at least one service as not very well run	57%	43%	51%	49%	48%	59%

- informants with higher scores on the index of knowledge of local government services:

TABLE 102 (Q.27a)

"Are there any of these services, or any others, which are not very well run in this local authority area?" by knowledge of local government

	<div> <div>"Low" ←</div> <div>Less than 3</div> <div>3/4</div> <div>5</div> <div>6</div> <div>7</div> <div>8/9</div> <div>"High"</div> </div>					
No. of correct answers (Base)	166	517	409	450	385	272
% mentioning at least one service as not very well run	30%	50%	52%	54%	56%	57%

- and electors in the higher socio-economic and education groups. It will be remembered that both of these groups (as did electors with higher scores on the index of knowledge) also showed a wider awareness of services which were *well* run in their respective local authorities. We would suggest that all these groups (inter-correlated as they must be) share a certain sensitivity in evaluating local government matters which stems from a more enhanced interest in such affairs:

TABLE 103 (Q.27a)

"Are there any of these services, or any others, which are not very well run in this local authority area?", by socio-economic status and education

	Socio-economic status						Education		
	1	2	Group 3	4	5	Never employed/ others	Higher	Secondary	Lower
(Base)	97	168	773	477	531	153	129	448	1622
% mentioning at least one service as not very well run	52%	55%	52%	53%	46%	46%	64%	56%	49%

We show in Table 104 the specific services mentioned as not very well run. For ease of reference we repeat (in parentheses) the comparable figures for the mention of each service as "quite well" run.

TABLE 104 (Q.27b)  
Services quoted as "not very well" run in informants' local authority areas

(Base)	(2199)	("Quite well" run)
	%	%
Recreational facilities	14	(18)
Hospitals	11	(29)
Refuse collection and disposal	11	(31)
Town planning	10	(5)
Provision of housing	9	(10)
Transport	6	(1)
Education and schools	5	(30)
Social security	3	(6)
Libraries	3	(30)
Electricity supply	3	(13)
Highways/roads/street lighting	2	(*%, incl. in "others")
Others	2	(1)
Don't know/Q.N.A.	*	(2)

Clearly the extent of dissatisfaction is on the face of it very much lower than that of willingness to approve particular services. However, four—and possibly five—public services may be regarded as not very well run locally by a recognisable minority of electors in the sample:

recreational facilities,  
hospitals,  
refuse collection and disposal,  
town planning, and  
provision of housing.

As with the results relating to favourable attitudes, only one of these five (hospitals again) is not the responsibility of a local government authority. Of the other four, three are the responsibility of local councils (including county borough councils).

It will be noted that the first three of these items were also among the services most frequently singled out (by other informants) as "quite well" run in their respective local authority areas. These may be taken therefore to be those services in which keen public interest is usually centred, and over the administration of which people are likely to be most sensitive. It is possible that, partly because they may be regarded as affecting the lives of most people at some time, they have come to be regarded as yardsticks for assessing the efficiency of provision of public services, irrespective of the authority responsible in each case.

The remaining two items of the five above both deal with housing matters since the first of these, town planning, has almost certainly been taken in part to include the responsibilities of local government departments in granting planning permission for building purposes.

We would again note certain outstanding points which arise from more detailed analysis of these figures, and which seem worthy of attention:

— criticism of the provisions relating to hospitals were particularly high in municipal boroughs and urban districts, and especially in conurbation

TABLE 105 (Q.27b)

Services quoted as "not very well" run, by type and size of local authority

(Base)	C.B.				M.B./U.D.					R.D. Total 538
	Total 751	Conurbation 294	250,000+ 206	60,000- 250,000 251	Total 910	Conurbation 113	60,000- 100,000 235*	30,000- 60,000 288	Up to 30,000 417	
Recreational facilities	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Hospitals	10	9	9	11	15	20	13	11	16	19
Refuse collection and disposal	5	7	7	6	17	27	12	18	14	8
Town planning	11	11	14	9	11	21	12	11	9	10
Provision of housing	8	6	8	10	13	21	14	12	12	7
Transport	10	12	12	8	9	15	9	6	10	7
Education and schools	6	8	8	3	5	8	5	7	3	7
Social security	5	5	3	5	5	11	6	5	3	6
Libraries	5	4	6	5	3	4	4	2	2	2
Electricity supply	2	2	2	2	2	9	9	1	*	5
Highways/roads/street lighting	1	2	*	2	2	1	*	1	4	7
Others	1	1	2	2	3	1	3	3	3	3
D.K./Q.N.A.	2	4	2	*	3	2	2	2	3	5
	*	—	—	1	*	—	*	—	1	—



M.B.'s and U.D.'s. We would again draw attention to the small base number of electors here. (See Table 105).

- in fact, although we would again advise caution in view of the relatively small number of informants recruited from conurbation M.B.'s and U.D.'s, we would note a very high level of dissatisfaction shared by them in respect of a number of specific services. This is, of course, related to the lower level of expressed satisfaction among conurbation authority residents upon which we commented earlier. In Table 106, we itemise six services where these electors display a wider frequency of criticism than the remaining section of the sample. (While the strict requirements of statistical significance do not permit us to be entirely conclusive, the overall pattern is consistent enough to merit interest). These six services are variously the responsibility of the local authority council and the county council:

TABLE 106 (Q.27b)

Six services quoted as "not very well" run, by conurbation M.B./U.D.'s and other local authorities

(Base)	Conurbation M.B./U.D.'s 113	Rest of sample 2086
	%	%
"Not very well" run:		
Administered by local authority council:		
Refuse collection	21	10
Recreational facilities*	20	14
Provision of housing	15	9
Administered by county council (or C.B. council):		
Town planning	21	9
Libraries†	9	2
Education and schools	11	5

\* May be administered also by parish councils.

† In about a half of the M.B.'s and U.D.'s sampled, libraries are the responsibility of the local authority council; in the remainder they are administered by the appropriate county council.

## Conclusions

In attempting to reach a conclusion with regard to the underlying aim of the questions in this section—whether it appears to make any difference to the electorate that a service should be administered by a local council, as distinct from a central government or other statutory agency—we must bear in mind that two of the services selected as representative of the latter type (hospitals and electricity supply) were "correctly" identified as such by only a minority of electors. Approximately as many electors in fact thought of them as administered by local government authorities. Thus a study of attitudes to them in respect of our main purpose is likely to be somewhat confused.

One of these three services—hospitals—figures quite frequently as a source of both favourable and unfavourable attitudes. Social security, conversely, is seldom mentioned either way. Electricity supply is mentioned rather more often in favourable terms, than unfavourable. There is no conclusive evidence from these figures, in our opinion, either to support or refute a contention that the public does differentiate. There is as much variation between the figures relating to services of the same type (for our purposes), as there is between types.

The foregoing analysis has identified some services which are more frequently regarded in a favourable than an unfavourable light, and some in which the converse to this is true. There is no evidence to suggest that these differences in attitude stem in any significant way from the pattern of responsibility for their provision, as distinct from the particular nature of the service itself.

### Summary

1. Knowledge of the responsibilities for the local provision of public services is found to be slightly greater than average among men, younger and middle-aged informants (compared with those over 55), and electors of a higher level of education and higher socio-economic status.

2. Generally speaking, there appears to be a slightly wider correct knowledge as to the authorities responsible for the administration of local-government-provided services. There is some confusion as to the bodies responsible for hospitals and electricity supply, though less for social security.

3. Electors are, on balance, more disposed to mention public services in a favourable than a critical manner: 73% are able to quote at least one public service which they consider quite well run in their local authority area; 51% are also able conversely to think of at least one with which they can find fault.

4. There is some indication that the level of dissatisfaction with public services is higher among informants living in conurbation authorities, particularly municipal boroughs and urban districts.

5. The services most frequently singled out for praise are refuse collection and disposal, education and schools, libraries and hospitals. All these are mentioned by approximately three in ten of the electors interviewed.

6. The services of which criticism is most often expressed (though by only approximately one in ten electors) are, once again, refuse collection and hospitals, in addition to recreational facilities, town planning and provision of housing.

7. It is possible that refuse collection, hospitals and recreational facilities are services over the administration of which electors are more sensitive. We might hypothesise that they have come to be seen as yardsticks for assessing the efficiency of local provision of public services, irrespective of the authority responsible in each case.

8. There is little conclusive evidence from the results of these questions to suggest that electors care whether public services should be the responsibility of local authorities or of other, central bodies.



## SECTION D

### ACCESSIBILITY TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICES, OFFICIALS AND REPRESENTATIVES

#### Introduction

We wished to study the factor of accessibility to local government in terms both of attitudes towards using the various offices, officials or representatives available and of actual experience of doing so. We wished particularly to explore the comparative prominence of officials and elected representatives in the mind of the electorate, in terms of their perceived accessibility and the suitability of approaching them to resolve enquiries, complaints or grievances connected with any of the public services to which we referred in the last section of this report.

At the background of this research requirement is the consideration that a basic facet of representation must be accessibility to the elected person on the part of his/her constituents. Whilst the actual need for this contact may be infrequently realised, it is to be considered a pre-requisite of any tenable system of democratic local government representation that provision should always exist for the elector to reach his local councillor should he so desire. The formal existence of a channel of communication does not, however, presuppose either the elector's awareness of its existence, or his willingness to use it. At one extreme we might suppose a condition of complete hostility towards or alienation from using the instrument of representation to resolve enquiries, complaints and grievances concerning local authority matters; some way along a dimension leading to a full readiness to do so, there may be a position of pragmatism in which the elector chooses, to a greater or lesser extent rationally, which is the most appropriate or effective path to pursue in order to reach satisfaction of his enquiry, grievance etc.

Similarly, it might be considered that a pre-requisite of any bureaucratic system of local government must be accessibility to, and responsiveness on the part of, the officials in whose charge the system is laid. A further aspect of this may be the physical accessibility (or proximity) of the town halls and council offices wherein the management of local government is located. We therefore wished to ascertain just how vital a consideration for most people is accessibility to the physical seat of local government in their respective local authority areas, and further to attempt to judge how far respondents might be willing to sacrifice accessibility to the town hall or main council office in return for (more) efficient service.

#### 1. Hypothesised Approaches to Various Offices and Officials

In ascertaining electors' perceptions as to the most appropriate body to contact, we presented them with a list of public services about which we had previously asked in the questions on their knowledge of local government responsibilities. We also asked them to consider, however, any other similar public services provided to the community, and we probed reactions as to the *first* point of contact which they might make, had they an enquiry or complaint about these services to resolve. The actual form of the question read as follows:

(Q.28a) "Suppose you wanted to make an enquiry or complaint about any of these services, or any others, whom would you get in touch with *first* of all?"

As may be seen from Table 107, the most frequent response was a generalised one, "the council", "the local council", or "the town hall", but sufficient nevertheless for us to see that it is the seat of local authority itself, rather than either the specific department concerned or the elector's representative, which is viewed as



TABLE 107 (Q.28a)

## First contact

(Base)	Total 2199
	%
<i>Administrative (general):</i>	
The "council"/local council/ town hall	33
County council	4
	37
<i>Administrative (specific):</i>	
Council department concerned	19
Head of council department concerned	10
	30
<i>Elected representatives:</i>	
M.P.	3
County councillor	1
Local councillor	12
Parish councillor	1
	17
<i>Other:</i>	
Citizens' Advice Bureau	3
Other answers	6
Don't know/Q.N.A.	8

the "correct" source of contact. However, bearing in mind our concern with the dichotomy of officials and elected representatives, we might conclude from this table that the latter play an evidently secondary rôle in the minds of electors.

Table 108 presents an analysis of replies to Question 28a in terms of type and size of local authority area. It shows that our general conclusion as to the secondary rôle played by the elected representative is maintained over all three types of local authority, and in all sizes of area. There is a very slight differential between electors in rural and urban authority areas in respect of their claimed propensity to contact the local councillor first of all: 15% of the former would do so, compared with 11%.\* To these 15% might reasonably be added a further 5% of R.D. electors who mentioned a parish councillor as their primary point of contact. We should further note that among county borough residents there was substantially more frequent mention of contacting the specific council department concerned, or the head of that department, rather than general allusions to the council or town hall as a whole. Whether this is a consequence of the larger number of local authority responsibilities and the possibly wider bureaucratisation of government in C.B.'s we are unable to say with any certainty. Table 108 further indicates, however, that this tendency may be a reflection as much of size of authority as of basic type.

Table 109 analyses the data in this area in terms of socio-economic status and education; Table 111 does so in terms of the index of knowledge of local government which we use throughout this survey. From these two sets of analysis we might conclude that:

- informants in the lower socio-economic groups and grades of education were more likely to mention their local councillor, while conversely those

\* The figure is, however, as high as 22% among the small number of electors in conurbation M.B.'s and U.D.'s.

TABLE 108 (Q.28a)  
First contact, by type and size of local authority

(Base)	C.B.				M.B./U.D.					R.D.
	Total 751	Conurbation 294	250,000+ 206	60,000- 250,000 251	Total 910	Conurbation 113	60,000- 100,000 235*	30,000- 60,000 288	Up to 30,000 417	Total 538
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<i>Administrative (general):</i>										
The "council"/local council/ town hall	27	23	28	32	41	32	36	43	44	29
County council	2	3	3	*	2	2	3	2	1	7
	29	26	31	32	43	34	39	45	45	36
<i>Administrative (specific):</i>										
Council department concerned	27	30	24	25	15	16	19	13	15	16
Head of council department concerned	11	9	12	13	10	10	11	10	11	9
	38	39	36	38	25	26	30	23	26	25
<i>Elected representatives:</i>										
M.P.	4	4	3	5	3	2	2	5	3	3
County councillor	1	*	*	*	1	-	2	1	*	1
Local councillor	11	13	10	9	11	22	11	10	8	15
Parish councillor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	15	18	14	14	15	24	15	16	12	24
<i>Other:</i>										
Citizens' Advice Bureau	4	3	5	4	2	2	2	1	3	1
Other answers	4	4	3	4	8	8	8	7	6	5
Don't know/Q.N.A.	9	10	11	8	8	6	6	8	8	8

\* Including supplementary sample.

TABLE 109 (Q.28a)  
First contact, by socio-economic status and education

(Base)	Socio-economic status						Education		
	1 97	2 168	Group 3 773	4 477	5 531	Never employed/ others 153	Higher 129	Secondary 448	Lower 1622
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<i>Administrative (general):</i>									
The "council"/local council/town hall	28	25	36	31	35	33	27	33	34
County council	5	3	4	2	3	2	6	2	3
	33	29	41	33	38	35	33	36	37
<i>Administrative (specific):</i>									
Council department concerned	28	25	21	20	15	12	22	22	18
Head of council de- partment concerned	24	19	10	11	7	7	22	13	9
	52	45	30	31	21	19	44	35	27
<i>Elected representatives:</i>									
M.P.	-	2	3	4	5	3	1	3	3
County councillor	-	-	*	1	1	3	-	1	1
Local councillor	2	13	9	15	15	16	5	9	14
Parish councillor	2	1	1	2	2	-	-	1	1
	4	16	14	21	22	22	6	13	19
<i>Other:</i>									
Citizens' Advice Bureau	3	2	2	2	3	5	3	2	3
Other answers	4	8	6	5	5	8	9	8	5
Don't know/Q.N.A.	4	1	9	9	10	11	5	6	10

electors who were classified as "higher" in socio-economic and educational terms were considerably more likely to think of going to "the top" right at the start of their enquiry or grievance and of contacting specifically the head of the relevant council department. We may further illustrate this "propensity to go to the top" by adding in some less frequently specified officials:

TABLE 110 (Q.28a)  
First contact with selected officials, by education

(Base)	"Higher" 129	"Secondary" 448	"Lower" 1622
<i>First contact:</i>			
Head of council department/ town clerk/clerk of council	26%	15%	10%

Returning again to the choice between officials and elected representatives, however, it is clear that while the general pattern (in favour of contacting the former) remains the same over all these sub-groups, there is a somewhat greater propensity to contact elected representatives (especially the local councillor) on the part of electors in lower socio-economic



and educational groups, and a conversely lesser likelihood of contacting council departments and officials.

- the more knowledgeable electors (whom we have seen earlier were by no means all drawn from among the more highly educated electors—even though the latter were disproportionately represented among them) were more likely to contact the appropriate offices or officials of the Council department relevant to their enquiry. They were also more able to give some positive reply to this question than were those with a lower score on the index:

TABLE 111 (Q.28a)

First contact, by knowledge of local government

(Base)	<div> <div>“Low”</div> <div>←</div> <div>→</div> <div>“High”</div> </div>			
	Less than 3 166	3-4 517	5-6 859	7-9 657
	%	%	%	%
<i>Administrative (general):</i>				
The “council”/local council/town hall	27	36	37	29
County council	7	4	3	3
	34	40	40	32
<i>Administrative (specific):</i>				
Council department concerned	15	14	17	27
Head of council department concerned	4	7	10	15
	19	21	27	42
<i>Elected representatives:</i>				
M.P.	2	4	3	3
County councillor	1	1	1	1
Local councillor	9	13	12	12
Parish councillor	2	3	1	*
	14	21	17	16
<i>Other:</i>				
Citizens’ Advice Bureau	—	2	2	3
Other answers	6	6	7	4
Don’t know/Q.N.A.	25	11	7	4

There was a very slight, and not entirely consistent tendency for electors living nearer to their respective town hall to quote that (or “the council” generally) as their first point of contact; conversely, among those living a longer distance away (and many of these were R.D. electors) there was a slight tendency to resort primarily to the local (or parish) councillors. In view of the small statistical size of these differences, however, we would not over-emphasise any conclusions from these two findings. We would suggest considerable caution in proposing any recommendations in respect of accessibility to authority or representatives on the basis of them alone.

If they received no satisfaction with the person or department which they had quoted, informants were asked, would they get in touch with any other person? Nearly a quarter of our sample (23%) thought not. (Q.28b).

Table 112 shows for each of the most frequently mentioned, or more important, sources the proportions of our sample quoting it as either a primary or

secondary contact in matters of enquiry, grievance or complaint. (For ease of reference, we also repeat, in parentheses, the figures given earlier for first contact alone).

TABLE 112 (Q.28a, b, c)

First or second contact

(Base)	2199	(First contact)
	%	
<i>Administrative (general):</i>		
The "council"/local council/town hall	36	(33 %)
County council	7	(4 %)
<i>Administrative (specific):</i>		
Council department concerned	22	(19 %)
Head of council department concerned	17	(10 %)
<i>Elected representatives:</i>		
M.P.	26	(3 %)
County councillor	2	(1 %)
Local councillor	24	(12 %)
Parish councillor	1	(1 %)
<i>Other:</i>		
Citizens' Advice Bureau	4	(3 %)
Other answers	13	(6 %)
<i>Don't know/Q.N.A.</i>	8	(8 %)
Would contact no one after first attempt	23	///

(Sub-totals can not be presented for this table, due to the possibility of duplicate response within each of the main groups).

By comparison with the figures shown for first contact alone, we may gain some idea of electors' conceptions as to the "correct" sequence of approach to (or past) local authority. It is apparent first of all, for example, that primary contact with offices or departments—when unsatisfactory or inconclusive—is seen subsequently as leading to an approach to specific *persons*. The person concerned may be the head of the relevant department, but is more likely to be an elected representative—the elector's Member of Parliament or local councillor. Thus we might conclude that while departments and officials are seen as the main *primary* point of contact, elected representatives are perceived as a second resort if their first approach should prove unsatisfactory.

We may explore this in more detail by means of Table 113, which constitutes in effect a sequential matrix of perceived approaches in the event of the informant's need to resolve an enquiry or grievance. It will be seen that it confirms our comments above in that, in all cases except that where the first point of contact is (in rural districts) the parish councillor, the elector's Member of Parliament is perceived most often as the secondary contact in matters of this nature. That he may also be seen as the *ultimate* contact is suggested by the fact that over three-quarters of those quoting their M.P. as their first contact would or could not conceive of a subsequent department or official to whom they would next turn. This proportion compares with an average percentage figure of 34% for other primary contacts.

TABLE 113 (Q.28b, c)

"And supposing you didn't get any satisfaction with [person/office mentioned as first contact], would you get in touch with any other person?" Who?

(Base)	First contact								Mayor/council chairman/ town clerk/ clerk to council			Other answers	Don't know
	The council/ local council/ town hall 732	County council 75	Council dept. concerned 422	Head of council dept. 228	M.P. 72	County councillor 17	Local councillor 264	Parish councillor 26	C.A.B. 54	39	84		
Second contact: No further contact/ Don't know	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
	38	29	31	30	76	35	33	23	30	26	36	100	
The "council"/local council/town hall	7	4	2	4	3	6	8	19	13	3	7		
County council	7	4	3	1	—	6	5	11	2	5	—		
Council department concerned	3	1	7	1	1	6	4	—	—	—	17		
Head of council department	5	1	15	7	—	12	6	4	6	10	2		
M.P.	26	36	23	25	7	18	29	15	20	28	12		
County councillor	1	3	*	*	—	7	3	8	—	5	—		
Local councillor	13	11	17	24	4	6	* 7	19	14	15	11		
Parish councillor	*	1	—	—	—	—	*	7	—	—	—		
Citizens' Advice Bureau	1	3	2	1	1	—	2	—	7	3	1		
Mayor/chairman of council/town clerk/ clerk to council	2	3	3	5	3	12	5	—	2	† 3	1		
Other answers	3	8	5	9	11	—	4	—	7	3	13		

\* One informant mentioned another (alternative) local councillor whom he would contact.

† One informant mentioned another person among those in this group.



The cross-analysis also provides evidence that of all primary/secondary combinations, the most frequently quoted are:

<i>First contact</i>	<i>Second contact</i>	<i>% of total sample</i>
1. The "council"/town hall	M.P.	9
2. Appropriate council department	M.P.	4
3. The "council"/town hall	Local councillor	4
4. Local councillor	M.P.	3.5
5. Appropriate council department	Local councillor	3
6. Appropriate council department	Head of council department	3

For completeness in this section, we present in Tables 114 and 115 breakdowns of hypothesised contact—either primary or secondary—in terms of socio-economic status, education, and type and size of local authority.

To some extent the alternative possibilities of specifying a particular office or person at either first or second stages tends to reduce the variations between

TABLE 114 (Q.28a, b, c)  
First or second contact, by socio-economic status and education

(Base)	Socio-economic status						Education		
	1 97	2 168	Group 3 773	4 477	5 531	Never employed/ others 153	Higher 129	Secondary 448	Lower 1622
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Administrative (general):</b>									
The "council"/local council/town hall	30	27	39	34	37	35	30	36	36
County council	8	9	9	6	7	4	10	8	7
<b>Administrative (specific):</b>									
Council department concerned	30	30	23	23	17	13	27	26	20
Head of council department concerned	40	28	15	16	11	16	30	22	14
<b>Elected representatives:</b>									
M.P.	23	23	25	29	27	20	19	25	27
County councillor	2	—	1	2	2	4	—	1	2
Local councillor	15	29	22	27	24	24	21	21	25
Parish councillor	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2
<b>Other:</b>									
Citizens' Advice Bureau	4	3	4	3	5	6	4	2	4
Other answers	19	21	14	12	11	11	23	17	11
<b>Don't know/Q.N.A.</b>	4	1	8	8	8	12	5	6	8
Would contact no-one after first attempt	14	16	22	20	28	30	17	18	25

TABLE 115 (Q.28a, b, c)  
First or second contact, by type and size of local authority

(Base)	C.B.				M.B./U.D.					R.D.
	Total 751	Conurbation 294	250,000+ 206	60,000- 250,000 251	Total 910	Conurbation 113	60,000- 100,000 235*	30,000- 60,000 288	Up to 30,000 417	Total 538
<i>Administrative (general):</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
The "council"/local council/ town hall	30	25	29	37	43	38	39	45	46	32
County council	2	3	3	1	7	6	5	7	7	16
<i>Administrative (specific):</i>										
Council department concerned	28	32	26	26	18	20	22	15	18	19
Head of council department concerned	16	15	17	18	17	12	18	16	19	16
<i>Elected representatives:</i>										
M.P.	27	24	29	27	26	33	25	26	25	24
County councillor	1	1	1	1	2	3	3	1	1	3
Local councillor	27	33	26	20	20	31	22	24	14	24
Parish councillor	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6
<i>Other:</i>										
Citizens' Advice Bureau	7	7	8	5	3	2	4	2	4	2
Other answers	12	10	9	15	16	14	21	17	15	10
<i>Don't know/Q.N.A.</i>	7	6	4	9	8	6	6	7	8	8
Would contact no-one after first attempt	24	24	26	22	22	18	22	25	22	23

\* Including supplementary sample.

these sub-groups in respect of the composite figures thus presented. Nevertheless, we would note two points in particular:

- informants in the highest socio-economic group (albeit a small number statistically) more frequently consider contacting the council department appropriate to their enquiry or complaint (and especially its head) than do other socio-economic groups; there is in fact an association between decreasing socio-economic status and less frequent mention of this particular point of contact.\* The highest socio-economic group conversely is less inclined than other groups to make reference to the local councillor at either primary or secondary stages.
- there is some evidence that local councillors assume more importance in authorities of greater population size. There is, conversely, less frequent mention of the "council", "local council" or "town hall". This may suggest that with increasing size of governmental unit, electors feel a greater need to call upon a representative who might speak for them (and, possibly, their part of the local authority area); it may also suggest that some degree of alienation—or of inaccessibility—comes into being among local authorities of greater size.

Bearing in mind our concern particularly with perceived accessibility to the elector's local councillor and to officials of his local authority council, we asked informants who had not mentioned these as either primary or secondary contacts whether they *would* think of getting in touch individually with them. (Q.28d). Although the answers to this are in our opinion suspect (they appear to show a too-ready inclination to agree), they do, in their negative respect, allow us to summarise the proportions of electors who share a hostility towards the idea of using either local councillors or officials as a means of assistance. These amount approximately one in four electors in the case of local councillors, and one in ten concerning local government officials:

(Base)	Local councillor 2199	Official of the department concerned 2199
	%	%
Mentioned as primary contact	12	31
Mentioned as secondary contact	12	7
Would otherwise think of contacting	50	52
Would not contact	26	10

No outstanding variations from these figures were found in terms of the various analyses carried out with these data. Perhaps we should note only that:

- perceived propensity to contact a local councillor was lowest among those with little or no knowledge of local government (according to the index we here employed), and was slightly lower among those in the higher and intermediate educational grades.
- whilst there was a similar tendency to the above, for those with a limited knowledge of local government also to show less likelihood of thinking of approaching a council official, conversely the higher the educational grade the greater appeared the propensity to contact an official.

These variations are in line with those upon which we have already commented in respect of the questions relating to primary and secondary contact.

A large proportion of those who showed disinclination to contact a local councillor were unable to advance any reasons for their opinion. This may suggest

\* There is a similar association with level of educational attainment.



the existence of somewhat irrational feelings mixed probably with a high degree of apathy and disinterest on the part of this group of electors:

TABLE 116 (Q.28e)

Reasons for not contacting local councillor, official of the department concerned

<i>Base: (all electors not willing to contact)</i>	<i>Local councillor</i> 568	<i>Official of department</i> 218
	%	%
Prefer to contact someone else/he would have to pass it on	20	22
Out of his province/not his job	4	3
Not important enough to bother him	8	6
No faith in him/not good enough/waste of time	24	11
Don't know who he is/how to get in touch	21	10
Other answers	2	3
Don't know	28	50

The largest group of replies in respect of both types of person was clearly that touching upon their ineffectiveness or the inefficacy of using them.

This sort of reason was given somewhat more often, however, in respect of councillors than of officials. The other major difference lay in difficulties over identifying or physically contacting the person concerned. Once again, these reasons were given more often when referring to councillors, though we would note that most of the 21 % in this category claimed that they did not know who their local councillor is; relatively few mentioned reasons tied to any difficulty in getting in touch with him or her.

In a separate question (Q.29) we probed electors' knowledge of the means of contacting their local councillor. Thirty-seven per cent said they would go to the councillor's home. A somewhat similar proportion (34 %) aimed to contact him or her at the town hall or main local authority council offices. Apart from those two answers, other means of contact were mentioned by only very small proportions of electors, as can be seen from Table 117:

TABLE 117 (Q.29a)

"How would you get in touch with your local councillor?"

<i>(Base)</i>	<i>Total</i> 2199	<i>C.B.</i> 751	<i>M.B./U.D.</i> 910	<i>R.D.</i> 538
	%	%	%	%
Councillor's home	37	29	36	51
Town hall/council offices	34	31	43	22
County hall/offices	2	1	1	3
Political party H.Q./offices	2	6	1	—
Meetings at which he is present	1	2	*	*
At his place of work	1	1	1	1
(Via) public library	1	1	1	1
(Via) Citizens' Advice Bureau	2	4	1	1
(Via) police station	*	*	*	*
Other answers	5	7	3	5
Don't know	16	20	11	15

There was a much greater propensity to quote the councillor's home among electors in rural districts (51 % of this group), while there was a correspondingly lower proportion among those in larger urban areas (C.B.'s) where the comparable figure was 29 %. This reveals without doubt the wider awareness among electors in the former group of the home address of their councillor and this is confirmed below. Electors in county boroughs were somewhat less likely than others to know *any* means of contacting their local councillor; in fact as many as 20 % were unable to say how they might do so.

Higher education and greater length of residence in the area (both possible correlates of personal acquaintance—however tenuous—with the councillor himself) led to a greater likelihood of contacting the councillor at his home:

TABLE 118 (Q.29a)

"How would you get in touch with your local councillor?" (main answers), by education and length of residence

	(Base)	Would contact him/her at	
		councillor's home	town hall/ council offices
		%	%
<b>Education:</b>			
Higher	(129)	47	29
Secondary	(448)	40	32
Lower	(1622)	36	34
<b>Length of residence:</b>			
Up to 3 years	(336)	26	39
Over 3-10 years	(491)	35	33
Over 10-20 years	(435)	41	29
Over 20 years/born here	(937)	41	34

Thirty-six per cent of the total sample claimed to know where (one of) their respective local councillors lived. We did not attempt to check this claim, and we might reasonably suppose this figure to be somewhat inflated over the actual level of true awareness. We are reinforced in this assumption by the fact there was certainly no apparent positive correlation between ("proved") knowledge of local government and a claim to know where the councillor lives. With the exception of the most extreme category of "ignorance", in fact, we might almost say there was an inverse relationship.

TABLE 119 (Q.29b)

"Do you happen to know where your local councillor lives?", by knowledge of local government

(Base)	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> <span>"Low" ←</span> <span>→ "High"</span> </div>				
	Less than 3	3-4	5	6	7-9
	166	517	409	450	657
Proportion claiming to know	33 %	38 %	42 %	36 %	33 %

Notwithstanding this doubt, however, awareness of the location of the councillor's home was comparatively wider among:

informants in rural districts than in urban areas, and in smaller urban local authority areas than in county boroughs;

electors in higher educational grades;  
 electors of longer residence in their "home" areas;  
 informants living very close to their respective town halls or main council offices (within a quarter-mile of them) and, conversely, those living the greatest distance from them. The latter are comprised largely of R.D. electors and we may suppose that many of them are referring here to the residence of their local parish councillor.

## 2. Experience of Accessibility

We should remember that answers to the questions on which we have reported above, were given by informants with a mind to entirely hypothetical circumstances. They may therefore represent only what is perceived as the correct or the ideal method of approach. They do not necessarily mirror the precise course of action which the individual elector might adopt in any actual circumstances.

A more reliable guide to this is to be derived from responses to questions which we posed concerning electors' past experience of occasions when they had enquiries, grievances or complaints to resolve which concerned local authority and other services. The main limitation upon our use of it is the fact that only about a quarter of the total sample (24%) claimed to have had the need to make contact for any of these purposes. The wide spread of specific services involved, as shown in Table 120, would reduce analysis to a study of very small numbers of people were we to pursue it in further detail:

TABLE 120 (Q.30b)  
 Services over which enquiries/complaints made

(Base)	2199
	%
Refuse collection and disposal	4
Housing repairs	4
Provision of housing	4
Highways/roads	3
Health/drains	3
Education and schools	2
Electricity supply	2
Town planning	2
Rating enquiries	1
Social security	1
Transport services	1
Hospital services	1
Water supply	1
Gas supply	1
Street lighting	1
Other services	1

Other than to make the very obvious point that the need to resolve enquiries or grievances generally arises in situations when the operation of public services impinges upon the more personal aspects of life, we would only note the following sections of the sample among whom there appeared a wider experience of contact:

- informants in higher socio-economic groups, and of a higher or secondary level of education; (see Table 121)
- informants living *very* close to their town hall/council offices (i.e. up to within a quarter-mile of it). This finding was present only for this particular group; it did not constitute a trend—that is, propensity to enquire or



TABLE 121 (Q.30a)

Experience of having made an enquiry/complaint over public services,  
by socio-economic status and education

(Base)	Socio-economic status						Education		
	1	2	Group 3	4	5	Never employed/ others	Higher	Secondary	Lower
	97	168	773	477	531	153	129	448	1622
	39%	32%	24%	25%	20%	22%	33%	31%	22%

complain was not related to increasing proximity. On the contrary, outside this minimum distance a slight, but noticeable *inverse* relationship was found between these two factors:

TABLE 122 (Q.30a)

Experience of having made an enquiry/complaint over public services,  
by distance from town hall

(Base)	Up to $\frac{1}{4}$ mile	$\frac{1}{4}$ – $\frac{1}{2}$ mile	$\frac{1}{2}$ –1 mile	1–1 $\frac{1}{2}$ miles	1 $\frac{1}{2}$ –2 miles	2–3 miles	Over 3 miles	(Q.N.A.)
	114	216	392	255	327	306	563	(26)
	36%	19%	23%	23%	25%	26%	25%	

— informants with higher scores on the index of knowledge of local government:

TABLE 123 (Q.30a)

Experience of having made an enquiry/complaint over public services,  
by knowledge of local government

(Base)	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <span>"Low"</span> <span>"High"</span> </div>					
	Less than 3	3/4	5	6	7	8/9
	166	517	409	450	385	272
	16%	19%	24%	26%	29%	32%

— we also show in Table 124 the relevant proportions of electors within each type and size of local authority who had had in the past an enquiry or complaint over public services. The widest frequency of past experience was found among electors living in conurbation authorities, irrespective of type:

TABLE 124 (Q.30a)

Experience of having made an enquiry/complaint over public services,  
by type and size of local authority

(Base)	C.B.				M.B./U.D.					R.D.
	Total	Conurbation	250,000+	60,000–250,000	Total	Conurbation	60,000–100,000	30,000–60,000	Up to 30,000	Total
	751	294	206	251	910	113	235*	288	417	538
	22%	28%	14%	22%	25%	35%	24%	20%	26%	26%

\* Including supplementary sample.

Collecting together the sum total of occasions upon which informants had personally had enquiries or complaints to make, some 609 instances, we find that in 58 % of these cases, there had been personal contact between the elector and the official, department or other person concerned. In 26 % of the cases, a telephone conversation had taken place, in 22 % there had been correspondence between the elector and the authority representative, and some other form of action had taken place on 3 % of the occasions. The smallest proportion of electors undertaking personally to contact the appropriate department or official was found in respect of enquiries or complaints over refuse collection and disposal. Further details of the form of contact used with regard to the most frequently mentioned services are to be found in Table 126.

We earlier saw that about 63 % of informants thought that in circumstances necessitating contact, they would firstly get in touch with "the council", the town hall, the appropriate council department or the head of that department. The proportion mentioning local councillor as their first point of contact was 12 %. The comparable figures (based upon the number of *occasions* when an enquiry, grievance or complaint had arisen) for actual contact with these bodies were somewhat higher than these: 85 % and 15 % respectively. Allowing for some reduction in these latter numbers in order to account for duplication of response caused by:

- (a) contact with *more than one* department and/or official on each occasion; and
- (b) a proportion of the sample experiencing more than one occasion on which to make an enquiry or complaint,

we might conclude that these figures are not incompatible. We would certainly conclude that, in actual experience, electors are considerably more likely to refer enquiries and complaints to offices or officials, rather than to their local councillor.

As we have stated above, the small numbers involved for each particular service do not allow us to be at all conclusive over any results derived from a breakdown of replies made in terms of this factor; however, we may note from Table 126 that contact with a local councillor had been proportionally more frequent in enquiries or complaints relating to (i) highways, roads and footpaths, and (ii) town-planning (planning permission). Both of these might be considered to be problem areas where the elector often seeks support in an attempt to bring pressure upon authority, or in an attempt to change authority decisions. (See Appendix C for a fuller discussion of this).

On exactly half of the occasions quoted to us, electors felt their enquiries/complaints *had* been dealt with both fully and satisfactorily. The remaining cases were assessed by the informants themselves as follows:

TABLE 125 (Q.30f)  
Informants' evaluation of the outcome of their enquiry/complaint

<i>Base: (occasions of enquiry/complaint)</i>	609
Enquiry/complaint dealt with fully but <i>unsatisfactorily</i>	20
Enquiry/complaint not dealt with fully, or at all	24
Enquiry/complaint still being dealt with	5
(Don't know/not answered)	1
	<hr/> 50

TABLE 126 (Q.30b-e)

Experience of having made an enquiry/complaint over public services: form of contact, and whom contacted, for the main services quoted

		Public service								
Base: (occasions of enquiry/complaint)	All occasions of enquiry/complaint/grievance 609	Refuse collection and disposal 93	Provision of housing 78	Housing repairs 75	Highways, roads, footpaths 64	Health and drains 59	Education and schools 37	Electricity supply 37	Town planning 35	All other services 131
Form of contact:	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Personal	58	31	86	71	45	68	70	35	63	55
Telephone	26	60	1	13	23	29	19	57	17	21
Correspondence	22	10	18	17	33	12	30	19	40	42
Other	3	1	1	4	5	5	3	—	6	4
None	1	1	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	2
Whom contacted, or considered contacting:										
(Council) department concerned	38	42	32	24	19	37	27	57	40	36
Specific official	47	46	51	38	38	54	41	43	49	45
Parish councillor	2	1	1	2	3	—	—	—	6	3
Local councillor	15	10	19	10	30	12	14	5	23	11
County councillor	*	—	1	—	2	—	—	—	—	1
M.P.	3	—	5	—	2	—	—	—	—	1
Friend/acquaintance	1	—	—	—	2	—	14	8	3	2
Other	10	8	1	4	16	7	32	8	—	2
Don't know/Q.N.A.	2	3	—	1	2	3	3	—	—	2



From this analysis, then, we must conclude that electors who had experienced a need to make contact with officials or representatives over local public service matters had not—in their own minds at least—been entirely satisfactorily served. This conclusion may be reinforced by the further comments which some passed upon the way their enquiry/grievance had been dealt with:

TABLE 127 (Q.30g)

Informants' comments upon the way in which their enquiry/complaint was dealt with

Base: (occasions of enquiry/complaint)	609
	%
<i>Favourable:</i>	
Dealt with speedily/quickly	8
Dealt with efficiently	7
Dealt with courteously/helpfully	11
<i>Unfavourable:</i>	
Dealt with slowly	11
Dealt with inefficiently	9
Dealt with discourteously/unhelpfully	7
(No further comments)	50

Paying caution again to the fact that small base numbers are involved, we might state that, of the main public services mentioned, enquiries or complaints concerning refuse collection and disposal, and health and drainage appear most often to have been dealt with both fully and satisfactorily (64 and 61 % out of 93 and 59 occasions respectively). Contact over matters relating to education and schools (30 % of 37 cases) and housing repairs (38 % of 75 cases) seems to have resulted in the smallest amount of comprehensive and satisfactory attention.

Still pursuing our particular interest in electors' accessibility to their local councillor (or their proclivity to contact him), we find that no more than a relatively small number (13 % in all) claimed ever to have been in touch with him/her over any matters at all (including those to which we have just referred). Allowing again for downward adjustment so as to account for duplication of answers, this compares very closely to the figure of 15 % of occasions of enquiry or complaint upon which a local councillor *had* been contacted. It also approximates to the proportion of 12 % of the total sample who supposed that they would get in touch with their local councillor *first of all* in the event of their having enquiries and grievances to resolve. In comparing it, however, with the summarised total proportion who earlier claimed themselves "potential" applicants, we are faced with a substantial discrepancy:

TABLE 128

Summary of hypothesised contact with local councillor

(Base)	2199
	%
Local councillor mentioned as primary contact (Q.28a)	12
Local councillor mentioned as secondary contact (Q.28c)	12
Would otherwise consider getting in touch with local councillor (Q.28d)	50
Total "potential"	74
Would not consider getting in touch with local councillor	26
Ever been in touch with a local councillor (Q.31a)	13

The extent of the discrepancy in our opinion measures (unfavourably) the value for the survey of these secondary indices of hypothetical or suppositional contact.

There were few outstanding variations from this figure of 13% who had ever contacted their councillor among various sub-groups in the sample.

The subject(s) over which local councillors had been contacted were, for a large part, miscellaneous complaints and grievances (44% of those in touch with them). The three main public services involved were provision of housing (29%), town planning—i.e. planning permission (11%), and streets and highways (8%). This is largely in line with the data on occasions of enquiry/ complaint which we showed earlier in this section.

In a subsequent part of this section of the report we deal with knowledge of the location of the elector's respective town hall and county hall. A further index of *experience* of accessibility which we may employ was personal contact with these two sets of offices. Taking the former, the town hall or main local authority council office, let us firstly see how closely informants' homes were situated to them:

TABLE 129

Distance of informants' home addresses from local authority town hall or main council office, by type of local authority

(Base)	Total 2199	C.B. 751	M.B./U.D. 910	R.D. 538
	%	%	%	%
<i>Distance:</i>				
Up to $\frac{1}{4}$ mile	5	*	10	5
Over $\frac{1}{4}$ mile, up to $\frac{1}{2}$ mile	10	3	20	2
Over $\frac{1}{2}$ mile, up to 1 mile	18	13	30	3
Over 1 mile, up to $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles	11	15	14	4
Over $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles, up to 2 miles	15	23	11	9
Over 2 miles, up to 3 miles	14	23	9	10
Over 3 miles	26	22	5	65

The three very distinct patterns of distribution for the different types of local authority are immediately understandable in terms of the physical size of these areas. In view of this variation it is not surprising, as we shall later see, that this factor (type of local authority) was closely related to the actual extent of physical contact with informants' respective town halls or main council offices.

This latter item, extent of contact, was measured by an index of the number of occasions within the previous twelve months that the informant had visited the town and county hall, for any purpose. Quite obviously, this is as much a function of need as of accessibility; nevertheless in view of the possible concern over re-siting, or centralisation, of main local authority offices which we subsequently discuss, it may be noteworthy that:

37% of electors had visited their town hall at least once during the past year; and

10% of electors living in M.B.'s, U.D.'s or R.D.'s\* had visited their county hall during this period.

\* Informants in county boroughs were asked only of the whereabouts of their respective town halls.



Notwithstanding the comment that necessity may in certain instances be as important a factor as accessibility in determining extent of contact, there is no doubt that the distance of the elector's home from the town hall *does* have a consequence for his likelihood of personally visiting the latter:

TABLE 130 (Q.34c)

Propensity to visit town hall/main council office, by distance from town hall

(Base)	Distance from town hall						
	Up to $\frac{1}{4}$ mile	$\frac{1}{4}$ – $\frac{1}{2}$ mile	$\frac{1}{2}$ –1 mile	1–1 $\frac{1}{2}$ miles	1 $\frac{1}{2}$ –2 miles	2–3 miles	Over 3 miles
	114	216	392	255	327	306	563
Proportion visiting town hall at least once during previous twelve months	61 %	62 %	52 %	44 %	40 %	35 %	24 %

Bearing in mind the varying distances involved for informants living in the three types of local authority area, we therefore see a reflection of the above pattern in an analysis by type of authority:

TABLE 131 (Q.34c)

Propensity to visit the town hall/main council office, by type of local authority

(Base)	Type of local authority		
	C.B. 751	M.B./U.D. 910	R.D. 538
Proportion visiting town hall at least once during previous twelve months	34 %	47 %	26 %

A comparable analysis of extent of contact with the *county hall* in terms of the type of authority in which the elector is resident shows that an estimated 9 % of the electorate in municipal boroughs and urban districts had visited their county hall at least once during the previous year, and 11 % of those living in rural districts. We did not measure how distant each informant's home was from his/her county hall, but on average it is not likely to have differed greatly between these two types of authority and this latter factor is therefore not a distinguishing one here.

### 3. Knowledge of town hall and county hall location; and attitudes towards accessibility to these.

In the event of a recommendation by the Royal Commission concerning the geographical size of local authority areas, there may be implications for the question of accessibility to local government in the siting of the main council offices, the town hall or county hall. If authority areas were to be increased in size for example, and they were to maintain just one main council building, by definition the average distance from electors' homes to that set of offices would be increased also. We therefore wished to study what effects this might have—how electors would react to having the physical manifestation of local government moved further away (or nearer, if a recommendation for smaller areas were to be made), how important in behavioural terms is physical accessibility at present, how many electors in fact correctly know where their respective main council offices, town and county halls are situated currently?



To take the latter question first of all, we might assume that if widespread ignorance were shown of the location of these buildings, no strong argument could be advanced against any proposals which would involve altering the average distance between electors' homes and the main offices. We therefore asked electors in our sample where their town and county halls were located and accepted as correct answers only those which indicated a fairly high degree of precision.

In fact, overall, 85% of the total sample were correctly aware of the location of the town hall/main offices of their respective local authority. Questions which we subsequently asked on attitudes towards the siting of these offices, and upon which we report below, therefore assume more importance.

Whilst some nine out of ten electors living in urban authorities were able to answer correctly, (there was little difference between residence in C.B.'s and M.B./U.D.'s in this respect), only some two-thirds of informants living in rural districts (67%) were able to give the true answer:

TABLE 132 (Q.34a)

Correct knowledge of the location of town hall/main council office, by type of local authority

(Base)	C.B. 751	M.B./U.D. 910	R.D. 538
% with correct answer	89%	92%	67%

One explanation of this variation may well be the greater distance at which rural district electors, on average, live from the site of their respective council offices. (As we have seen, nearly two-thirds of R.D. residents live more than three miles from this centre). Secondly there could, in some instances, be confusion over the correct location arising from dispersion of offices within a district (though it is likely that such an argument might equally apply to the other types of authority as well). Thirdly, there is evidence which we have already seen from other parts of the survey that the amount of personal contact with R.D. council offices is considerably lower than that with town halls, and this may suggest a stronger emphasis upon the authority and activities of the county council.

We may, however, examine the first of these possible explanations more closely. While it is clear that R.D. dwellers are somewhat less likely to know the

TABLE 133 (Q.34a)

Correct knowledge of the location of the town hall/main council office, by distance from the town hall within type of local authority

(Base)*	C.B.				M.B./U.D.				R.D.	
	Up to 1 mile	Over 1-2 miles	Over 2-3 miles	Over 3 miles	Up to 1 mile	Over 1-2 miles	Over 2-3 miles	Over 3 miles	Up to 3 miles	Over 3 miles
	122	283	173	163	544	227	81	49	180	351
% with correct answer	93%	90%	89%	82%	91%	90%	93%	96%	77%	62%

\* Distance from town hall not recorded for:

10 informants in C.B.'s,

9 informants in M.B.'s and U.D.'s, and

7 informants in R.D.'s.

location of the district council offices if they do not live in reasonably close proximity to them, it is also evident that this factor does not provide by any means a complete reason for the variation. In urban authority areas, distance of residence from the town hall was a factor influencing knowledge of its location only among county borough residents. (See Table 133).

We show in Table 134 an analysis of correct knowledge of the location of town hall or main offices in terms of (a) socio-economic status, (b) education and (c) size of local authority area. It will be seen, perhaps surprisingly, that there is hardly any significant variation between the various groups comprising the first two of these factors. Neither can we conclude that there is any consistent association between population size and correct knowledge of town hall location:

TABLE 134 (Q.34a)

Correct knowledge of the location of the town hall/main council office,  
by socio-economic status, education and size of local authority

	(Base)	% with correct answer	
<i>Socio-economic status:</i>			
Group 1	(97)	88	
2	(168)	90	
3	(773)	84	
4	(477)	88	
5	(531)	80	
Never employed/others	(153)	86	
<i>Education:</i>			
Higher	(129)	84	
Secondary	(448)	84	
Lower	(1622)	85	
<i>Population size:</i>			
C.B.	Conurbation	(294)	87
	250,000+	(206)	88
	60,000-250,000	(251)	92
M.B./U.D.	Conurbation	(113)	95
	60,000-100,000	(235)*	89
	30,000-60,000	(288)	88
	Up to 30,000	(417)	94

\* Including supplementary sample.

As a further guide to possible reaction in the event of a re-siting of local authority central offices, we endeavoured to ascertain how many electors thought the town hall (or main offices) was unsatisfactorily distant from their homes already (Q.34b). Table 135 shows that over a quarter of those answering this question\* (26%) felt their town hall or main council offices to be a "very" or "quite" long way away from their home. It also shows quite expectedly a strong correlation between greater distance of residence from the town hall and increased likelihood of feeling it too far away. This overall figure of 26% varied according to type of authority; it was considerably lower—again understandably—among informants in the smaller urban authority areas.

Although, as can be seen from Table 135, an almost linear effect is visible in the relationship between distance of residence and a feeling that that distance is rather

\* The question was asked only of those informants who had been able to give an answer as to the location of their respective town hall or main council offices, whether this answer happened to be correct or incorrect.



TABLE 135 (Q.34b)

**"How far away from here would you say the town hall/main council office is?"  
by distance from town hall within type of local authority**

<i>(All giving an answer as to location of town hall at Q.34a)</i>		<i>Considering the town hall/main offices at present to be</i>		
	<i>(Base)</i>	<i>"very" or "quite" near</i>	<i>a "very" or "quite" long way away</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>All informants</i>	<i>(2005)</i>	<i>%</i> 72	<i>%</i> 26	<i>%</i> 2
<i>C.B.:</i>				
<i>(Distance from town hall)*</i>				
Total	(696)	64	33	3
Up to 1 mile	(117)	86	14	—
Over 1-2 miles	(264)	70	27	4
Over 2-3 miles	(156)	57	39	4
Over 3 miles	(150)	42	53	5
<i>M.B./U.D.:</i>				
<i>(Distance from town hall)†</i>				
Total	(868)	81	18	1
Up to 1 mile	(524)	87	12	1
Over 1-2 miles	(211)	78	21	1
Over 2-3 miles	(75)	72	28	—
Over 3 miles	(49)	55	41	4
<i>R.D.</i>				
<i>(Distance from main offices)‡</i>				
Total	(441)	69	30	1
Up to 1 mile	(54)	96	4	—
Over 1-2 miles	(61)	75	25	—
Over 2-3 miles	(48)	69	31	—
Over 3 miles	(274)	62	36	1

\* Not recorded for 10 informants

† Not recorded for 9 informants

‡ Not recorded for 7 informants

great, it may be surmised that the crucial distance at which this feeling becomes pronounced is very approximately in the region of 2 miles. At this point the town hall begins to be seen as rather far away by a quite substantial proportion of residents.

We also asked informants a more direct question\* as to their opinion upon accessibility to their respective town hall and main council offices. In one sense the replies to this question were disappointing, but in this very fact they may paradoxically be regarded as quite illuminating. Six in ten electors said either that they do not care whether their town hall should be fairly near to their home or further away, or that they did not know what their opinion would be on this. Of those who *did* express an opinion, a large majority was in favour of proximity to the town hall or main offices. (See Table 136).

\* Q.36a. "Some people have told us that they like the town hall or main council offices to be fairly near their home so that they can feel 'in touch' with them if necessary. Others have said that they would prefer them being further away providing that the services do not suffer. A third group have said they don't really care one way or the other. Which of these three groups would you say you agree with?"



TABLE 136 (Q.36a)

## Opinion as to ideal distance of town hall/main council offices

(Base)	2199
<i>Town hall/main offices should be</i>	%
Fairly near	35
Further away	5
Don't care	54
Don't know/Q.N.A.	6

In terms of the three types of local authority area with which we are concerned, the least apathy and the widest support for the town hall being "fairly near" was shown by electors living in those local authorities where the town hall presently is closer, on average, to electors' homes—municipal boroughs and urban districts:

TABLE 137 (Q.36a)

## Opinion as to ideal distance of town hall/main council office, by type of local authority

(Base)	C.B. 751	M.B./U.D. 910	R.D. 538
<i>Town hall/main office should be</i>	%	%	%
Fairly near	32	43	30
Further away	4	4	7
Don't care	56	50	56
Don't know/Q.N.A.	9	3	7

It is clear, however, that the above variation is a secondary consequence of the actual distance of the elector's home at present from his/her respective town hall or main council office. Those who live closer to the town hall more widely feel it should be fairly near than do those who presently live further away:

TABLE 138 (Q.36a)

## Opinion as to ideal distance of town hall/main council office, by distance from town hall

(Base)*	Up to $\frac{1}{2}$ mile 330	Over $\frac{1}{2}$ –1 mile 392	Over 1–1 $\frac{1}{2}$ miles 255	Over 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ –2 miles 327	Over 2–3 miles 306	Over 3 miles 563
<i>Town hall/main office should be</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%
Fairly near	48	43	40	32	28	26
Further away	3	4	4	6	4	7
Don't care	46	49	49	55	64	57
Don't know/Q.N.A.	3	3	6	7	4	10

\* Not recorded for 26 informants.

There was no significant difference between the opinions on this question of those electors who knew the correct location of their town hall and those who did not. A reflection of the distance of electors' homes from the present site is again

illustrated however, in a cross-analysis of replies to this question on how near (or far) the town hall *should* be with informants' subjective evaluation of how near or far it currently *is*. Those who consider the present site of the town hall to be nearer are much more likely to prefer it to remain that way, though even among this (large) group well over half had no definite opinion; they "did not care". Conversely, those who thought the present distance longer, were more inclined to be either apathetic or to prefer the town hall to be further away:

TABLE 139 (Q.36a)

Opinion as to ideal distance of town hall/main council office, by perceived present distance of town hall (Q.34b)

(Base)	Town hall/main office at present thought to be				
	Very near 176	Quite near 1274	Quite a long way away 474	A very long way away 41	Don't know/ Q.N.A. 214
	%	%	%	%	%
Town hall/main office should be					
Fairly near	42	39	27	15	31
Further away	3	4	6	10	6
Don't care	54	52	60	63	58
Don't know/Q.N.A.	1	5	7	12	11

There was some indication that, the higher the educational level of the elector, the less likely he was to wish the town hall to be sited fairly near to him. He or she showed a greater propensity either not to care, or—though still in a very small minority—to prefer it to be further away. Some reflection of this pattern is shown in the analysis by socio-economic status, but not to such a marked degree by any means:

TABLE 140 (Q.36a)

Opinion as to ideal distance of town hall/main council office, by socio-economic status and education

(Base)	Socio-economic status						Education		
	1 97	2 168	Group 3 773	4 477	5 531	Never employed/ others 153	Higher 129	Secondary 448	Lower 1622
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Fairly near	31	34	35	33	40	29	28	32	37
Further away	6	4	5	5	5	2	9	4	5
Don't care	58	58	54	55	49	59	62	58	52
Don't know	5	4	6	7	6	10	1	6	7

Informants who thought the town hall or main council offices should be fairly near at hand advanced two main reasons in support of their opinion. These are shown as the first two items in Table 141 though the third and fourth items are clearly extensions of the argument contained in the first. To summarise: proximity makes for greater *personal* accessibility, which is desirable because it is more effective.

TABLE 141 (Q.36b)

## Reasons for the town hall/main council office to be fairly near

(Base)	776
	%
Allows for personal visits; makes it easier/more convenient to visit personally	67
Town hall/main office should be near/central to/accessible from the area or community it serves	21
Personal contact (with officials etc.) is better/more prompt/more effective (than 'phone, correspondence, etc.)	7
Improves communication with administration/departments/officials	3
Other reasons	*
Don't know/Q.N.A.	5

The relatively few informants who thought the main offices should be further away suggested a variety of explanations, ranging from rational arguments over the logistics of organisation, through expressions of disinterest as a result of their experiencing no need to visit the town hall, to downright hostility towards the proximity of officialdom:

TABLE 142 (Q.36b)

## Reasons for the town hall/main council office to be further away

(Base)	102
	%
Functional considerations; need for administration to be rationalised/centralised	27
Location does not matter so long as services/efficiency maintained	22
Don't want to have authority/officialdom too near	13
Don't use the town hall/offices very often; have nothing to do with them	10
If it were too near, one would be tempted to go there for unimportant matters	8
Town hall should not occupy the space it (now) does; should be located outside the town, on development land, etc.	3
Dislike the (look of the) building; ugly architecture	3
Other reasons	1
Don't know/Q.N.A.	17

Finally, informants who said they do not care where the town hall or main offices are situated largely thought the location was an unimportant matter, in many cases because they rarely (need to) visit the building at present:

TABLE 143 (Q.36b)

## Reasons for not caring about the location of town hall/main council office

(Base)	1185
	%
Wouldn't make any difference wherever it was; it doesn't matter provided that the service is satisfactory	34
Never visit/don't use often enough	25
Doesn't matter where it is, so long as it is central, for everyone to be able to get to	10
When something (to visit about) is important enough, distance is no object	9
Present location is satisfactory; no point in changing it	8
Not interested in the local council	5
Other reasons	*
Don't know/Q.N.A.	13



We might note that the first reason detailed in Table 143 showed a slightly greater frequency of mention among electors now living further from their town halls/main offices. (Many of those electors living in the more distant categories, it will be remembered, are residents in rural districts):

TABLE 144 (Q.36b)

(Base: Informants who do not care where town hall/office should be situated)	Distance from town hall/main offices					
	Up to $\frac{1}{2}$ mile	Over $\frac{1}{2}$ –1 mile	Over 1–1 $\frac{1}{2}$ miles	Over 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ –2 miles	Over 2–3 miles	Over 3 miles
	153	193	125	179	196	324
"Wouldn't make any difference wherever it was; it doesn't matter provided that the service is satisfactory."	26%	31%	30%	34%	36%	39%

A question on knowledge of the location of the elector's respective county hall was asked only of those informants resident in municipal boroughs, urban districts and rural districts (Q.35a). Correct answers were given by a comparatively much smaller proportion of electors than was shown in the case of the question on the site of the town hall/main offices, with only just over a half of the total providing a true response:

TABLE 145 (Q.35a)

Correct knowledge of the location of county hall, by type of local authority

(Base)	Total 1448	M.B./U.D. 910	R.D. 538
% with correct answer	52%	50%	55%

As may be seen from Table 145, R.D. electors were very slightly more aware of the location of their county hall than were those living in the small urban authority areas.

There was some slight indication of a wider correct awareness among electors living in the smaller towns:

TABLE 146 (Q.35a)

Correct knowledge of the location of the county hall, by population size within M.B.'s and U.D.'s

(Base)	Conurbation 113	M.B./U.D.		
		60,000– 100,000 235*	30,000– 60,000 288	Up to 30,000 417
% with correct answer	42%	38%	46%	52%

\* Including supplementary sample.

Whereas we had observed no recognisable variation between socio-economic groups and levels of education in their awareness of the location of the local authority town hall or main offices, there was a very clear correlation with knowledge of where the county hall is sited. (See Table 147).

TABLE 147 (Q.35a)

Correct knowledge of the location of the county hall, by socio-economic status and education

<i>Base (electors in M.B.'s, U.D.'s, R.D.'s):</i>	<i>Socio-economic status</i>						<i>Education</i>		
	1	2	Group 3	4	5	<i>Never employed/ others</i>	<i>Higher</i>	<i>Secondary</i>	<i>Lower</i>
	70	125	549	273	323	108	102	334	1012
Correct knowledge of county hall location	77%	65%	53%	52%	40%	46%	63%	61%	47%

We went on to ask informants in municipal boroughs, urban districts and rural districts\* to adjudge more evaluatively the distance between their homes and their respective county halls. Table 148 shows that over two-thirds of those of whom we asked this question considered the county hall quite a long way or a very long way from their homes. These electors were mostly inclined to give the less extreme response ("quite a long way": 53%; compared with "a very long way": 15%) and this may be taken as a small qualification of any finding that electors have strong feelings over the distance of the county hall from their homes.

TABLE 148 (Q.35b)

"How far away from here would you say the county hall is?", by type of local authority

<i>Base: (all providing an answer as to location of county hall at Q.35a)</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>M.B./U.D.</i>	<i>R.D.</i>
	985	606	379
<i>% considering county hall to be</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
"Very" or "quite" near	29	22	42
"A very", or "quite" a long way away	68	74	57
Don't know/Q.N.A.	3	4	2

Table 148 also illustrates the stronger feeling of proximity to the county hall which electors in rural districts share, in comparison with urban authority electors.

### Accessibility and Efficiency

In the introduction to this section we noted that we wished to explore, if this were possible, the dichotomy of accessibility and efficiency in respect of electors' attitudes towards local government. Without necessarily assuming mutual exclusivity, which is the more important to the general public? Any conclusions which we might reach on this topic must largely be by inference from our data, since no direct confrontation was made in the questionnaire between the two ideas.

Let us firstly look at the measures we have of actual experience of the need for accessibility. The main ones may be summarised as follows:

- about a quarter of all electors have had a past experience in which they had an enquiry or grievance to resolve; we may estimate that roughly 21% of the total sample, (that is, nearly all who had an enquiry or grievance) in fact contacted a council department or official.

\* That is, those who had provided an answer at Q.35a as to the location of their county hall.



- 37% of the electorate sampled had visited their respective local authority town hall or main council office during the past year, and 10% (of electors in M.B.'s, U.D.'s and R.D.'s) had been to their county hall.

Secondly, we can state that, in attitudinal terms:

- 66% of the total sample consider their town hall at present to be very or quite near to their home;
- 35% consider that it *should* be located fairly near. (This figure rises among those who now live nearer to it). We may add to this figure a further 10% of the total sample who said they did not care where the location of the town hall is, but also mentioned the need for accessibility, or satisfaction with the present site.

Thus, our best estimate as the proportion of the total sample which values accessibility fairly highly is in the region of 45%. (As we shall see in the next section of the report, this is very close to the figure of 46% which represents the proportion among informants with quite strongly held opinions on the ideal size of the local authority area which considers that an increase in the size of the area would make local government more out of touch with the people there.)

Looking now at the question of attitudes towards efficiency (which—as we have pointed out above—is not necessarily an antithesis to the notion of accessibility), we may say firstly that:

- approximately 23% of the total sample gave reasons of efficiency or administration in support of their opinion as to the optimum distance of the town hall, irrespective of what that opinion was.\*
- as, again, we shall see in the subsequent section, 25% of informants with quite strong opinions on the subject of local authority area size—themselves comprising approximately a half of the total—thought that greater efficiency would result from an increase in the size of the council area. On the other hand, an almost exactly similar proportion—24%—thought that greater efficiency would be derived from a contraction in the local authority area.

We would conclude therefore that around 20–25% of the sample, as far as we can judge, value efficiency quite highly.

Against all of these informants—and obviously somewhere between and overlapping with them—must be put a very substantial number of electors who appear to have no strong decided opinion on the subject of accessibility/efficiency, or are even hostile to the two ideas. Their number may be estimated at around 37%.

### Summary

1. The most frequent *primary* source which informants would consider contacting in order to deal with any enquiries or complaints is an administrative one—rather than an elected representative. The most frequently quoted source is a somewhat vague one—the “council”, or “the town hall”—but the specific council department or head of department concerned with their enquiry often features in replies also.

2. Informants in rural districts, and those of a lower level of education and socio-economic status are more likely than others to think of contacting an elected representative—usually a local councillor.

---

\* In fact, most of these replied: “don’t care, as long as the service remains satisfactory”.



3. Should primary contact with an office or department be unsatisfactory or inconclusive then a quarter of the electors would take no further action; of the remainder the majority would consider approaching some specific *person*: the head of the relevant department or, more likely, the elector's Member of Parliament or local councillor. It may be concluded in fact that while departments and officials are seen as the main primary point of contact for electors, elected representatives are then perceived as a second resort when a first approach has proved unsatisfactory. The M.P. appears often to be considered the ultimate source for the resolution of problems.

4. More than one in four electors would not consider contacting their local councillor at all. The three main reasons for this were said to be his incompetence, the greater suitability of contacting someone else, and lack of knowledge as to who the local councillor actually is, or how to get in touch with him.

5. Electors who *did* want to contact their councillor would think of contacting him either at his home or at the town hall or main council offices. Electors in rural districts are more likely to contact him at his home, as are those who have lived longer in the area, or are of a higher educational standard. Thirty-six per cent of the total sample claim to know where (one of) their respective local councillors live.

6. Only one in ten informants would not consider contacting a department official at all over specific problems or enquiries.

7. Just less than a quarter of the sample has ever experienced a need to contact local offices, officials or representatives over enquiries or complaints concerned with local government services. These electors are more frequently in higher socio-economic grades, of a higher level of education, live closer to the town hall, and have a greater knowledge of local government.

8. In the greater majority of these cases, informants have made personal contact with an official or a department; the proportions of people who have contacted a council department or official, or a local councillor, are not incompatible with the figures relating to the conceived first choice of contact.

9. Fifty per cent of all enquiries and complaints are considered to have been dealt with both fully and satisfactorily. Matters relating to refuse collection, health, and drainage are considered to have been dealt with most satisfactorily; those relating to education are considered to have resulted less frequently in a satisfactory outcome.

10. Thirteen per cent of electors say they have at some time contacted their local councillor(s). While the subjects of contact were, for the most part, miscellaneous complaints and grievances, the three main public services involved were provision of housing, town planning (i.e. planning permission), and streets and highways.

11. Eighty-five per cent of the sample knows correctly the location of their respective town hall, or main local authority offices. Electors in rural districts are considerably less aware of the precise location than are urban residents. Distance of residence from the main office is seen to affect adversely both the level of correct awareness of the latter site, and the propensity to visit (as measured by the number of visits made in the last year). Overall, no more than 37% of electors have visited their respective town hall/main office during the previous year.

12. Over a quarter of our informants feel that their town hall is a "very" or "quite" long way from their home; this proportion is somewhat larger among C.B. and R.D. residents, and understandably increases with longer distance of residence from this site.

13. Of those informants expressing an opinion (only four in ten electors), as to the optimum position of the town hall *vis-à-vis* their homes, the majority would prefer it to be fairly near (rather than further away); in fact the nearer electors live to the town hall at present, the more likely they are to think it *should* be near.

14. Electors who would prefer the town hall to be nearer feel that proximity makes for greater *personal* accessibility. This is felt to be more desirable than other forms of contact.

15. Electors' knowledge of their respective county hall (excluding electors living in county boroughs) is much less precise. Only 52% are able correctly to indicate its location. Rural district electors are very slightly more aware of the location of the county hall than are those living in the small urban authority areas.

16. Over two-thirds of these electors consider their county hall quite a long way or a very long way from their homes. A stronger *feeling* of proximity to the county hall is visible among electors in rural districts than among urban residents.

17. We have concluded that the best estimate as to the proportion of the total sample which values accessibility fairly highly is around 45%. We have also concluded that approximately 20-25% value efficiency quite highly.



## SECTION E

### ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE SIZE OF LOCAL AUTHORITY AREAS

#### Introduction

The terms of reference of the Royal Commission include consideration of boundaries and the general size of local authorities.

Much of the earlier part of this report has been concerned, either through direct questioning or by means of cross-analysis, with aspects of the size of various types of area—with the size of present local government divisions, with that of “felt” community areas, and so on. In this section of the report, we wish further to explore public attitudes towards possible changes in the size of their local authority areas. We shall be particularly concerned with an attempt to quantify these attitudes into a fourfold categorisation:

electors who would prefer to see their present local authority area *bigger*,  
those who would prefer to see it *smaller*,  
those who think it *should not change*,  
and those who are apathetic, disinterested or have *no opinions*.

We look at the hypothetical results which electors consider might follow expansion or contraction of their local authority areas.

#### 1. Extent and strength of opinion

The form of question employed to investigate opinions on this topic was as follows (Q.38a):

“Now do you think the present . . . (local authority) council area should be made bigger, so as to take in some of the districts surrounding; or would you like to see it concerned with only a small area; or would you like to see it stay the same as it is now?”

Except for informants who spontaneously replied that they do not care either way, or did not know what their opinion is on this subject, we further asked how strongly each informant was in favour of his opinion. These replies are summarised in Table 149 for the entire sample.

The weight of opinion is very clearly upon the *status quo*, and we might conclude that there is a wider extent even of apathy and disinterest among these answers than there is of a shared attitude in favour of any sort of positive change. Although, in overall terms, there can be no denial of the emphatic nature of this pattern, an even clearer picture emerges if we pay attention to the views only of those who hold at least “quite strongly” to their opinions. (It is interesting and in some ways disheartening, incidentally, that these amount to no more than 48% of the total.)

Thus, nearly two-thirds of those who are quite strongly in favour of their expressed opinion, support the idea that there should be no change in the size of their present local authority area. Of the remainder, the “expansionists” outnumber by four to one those who would like to see their local authority area contracted in size.

Looking at a breakdown of the four opinion groups which we have isolated,



TABLE 149 (Q.38a, b)  
Attitude towards optimum size of local authority area (i)

(Base)	2199
	%
<i>Local authority area should be:</i>	
Bigger	
Very strongly in favour	7
Quite strongly in favour	7
Just a little in favour	4
(Don't know)	*
Total	18
Smaller	
Very strongly in favour	2
Quite strongly in favour	2
Just a little in favour	1
(Don't know)	*
Total	5
The same as now	
Very strongly in favour	15
Quite strongly in favour	16
Just a little in favour	23
(Don't know)	4
Total	57
Don't care either way	11
Don't know/Q.N.A.	9

TABLE 150 (Q.38a, b)  
Attitudes towards optimum size of local authority area (ii)

<i>Base: (all with strongly-held opinions)</i>	1057
	%
<i>Local authority area should be:</i>	
Bigger	28
Smaller	7
The same as now	65

in terms of authority type as well as population size and density (see Table 151), we may come to the following conclusions:

- slightly more informants living in county boroughs are in favour of increasing the size of their local authority area than is to be found among residents in the smaller urban authorities; in turn, the latter are nevertheless a little more "expansionist" than R.D. electors.
- such a variation, however, masks two important internal differences among certain population size groups. In fact, all the size categories within urban authorities display much the same proportions of informants in favour of expansion (around 17–19% of their individual totals) with the exception of:

smaller county boroughs (60,000–250,000 population)—30%; and  
M.B.'s and U.D.'s of 60,000–100,000 population—24%

TABLE 151 (Q.38a, b)

Attitudes towards optimum size of local authority area, by type and size of local authority and population density

(Base)		Should be:			
		Bigger	Smaller	Same	No opinion
		%	%	%	%
<i>All informants</i> (2199)		18	5	57	20
<i>Type and size of local authority:</i>					
C.B.	Conurbation (294)	17	8	57	18
	250,000+ (206)	19	4	54	23
	60,000-250,000 (251)	30	1	49	20
M.B./U.D.	Conurbation (113)	18	5	58	19
	60,000-100,000 (235)*	24	3	57	15
	30,000-60,000 (288)	17	6	62	15
R.D.	Up to 30,000 (417)	19	2	59	20
	(538)	14	6	59	22
<i>Population density (persons per acre):</i>					
0-1 (307)		11	4	58	27
Over 1-5 (517)		14	7	62	17
Over 5-10 (365)		18	3	59	20
Over 10-15 (380)		21	2	58	19
Over 15-20 (242)		23	7	50	20
Over 20 (388)		24	3	53	20

\* Including supplementary sample.

- there is a very obvious tendency for feelings that the authority area should be bigger to become more widely shown as density of population increases.
- the proportions within each sub-group which subscribe to the opinion that the local authority area should be smaller fluctuate around the 5% mark. Only in conurbation county boroughs is there some evidence to suggest a very slightly larger proportion who hold that the size of their respective areas should be reduced. Otherwise, such variations as do occur among different sub-groups may well be attributable to the influence of purely local causes.
- the lowest proportions holding that no change should occur in the size of their local authority area are found in the smaller county boroughs (60,000-250,000 population), and the more densely populated wards sampled (over 15 persons per acre). In each of these cases, nevertheless, approximately a half of the individual total *was* in favour of the *status quo*.

Table 152 suggests that slightly greater support for a larger local authority area comes from electors of a lower educational level; conversely electors in the higher educational group were more in favour of retaining the same size of local authority area.

An analysis of attitudes in terms of the expressed size of the informant's "home" area shows no entirely conclusive pattern. There is, however, a very slight suggestion that informants with a wider conception of the community area are also more in favour of a bigger local authority area. (See Table 153).

TABLE 152 (Q.38a)

Attitude towards optimum size of local authority area, by socio-economic status and education

(Base)	Socio-economic status						Education		
	1 97	2 168	Group 3 773	4 477	5 531	Never employed/ others 153	Higher 129	Secondary 448	Lower 1622
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Should be:									
Bigger	19	21	15	23	20	13	13	17	19
Smaller	8	5	4	6	3	3	6	4	5
The same as now	61	58	58	56	57	48	65	58	56
Don't care either way	7	11	13	9	12	17	11	11	11
Don't know/Q.N.A.	5	5	10	6	8	19	5	10	9

TABLE 153 (Q.38a)

Attitude towards optimum size of local authority area, by size of "home" area

(Base)	Informants with a "home" area							Informants without a "home" area (Q.N.A.)					(5)
	Total 1710	"Ex- tended" area 110	Town/ city equiv. 264	Ward equiv. 419	Part of ward 570	Part of Parish 180	Part of parish 156	Total 484	"Ex- tended" area/ town/city equiv. 58	Ward equiv. 108	Part of ward 199	Parish/ part of parish 118	
Should be:	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Bigger	18	22	22	20	18	11	15	19	31	20	20	10	
Smaller	4	5	2	5	4	2	8	6	3	5	5	10	
The same as now	59	64	55	61	59	66	55	50	43	55	50	50	
Don't care either way	11	7	14	7	12	12	10	13	7	15	11	17	
Don't know/ Q.N.A.	8	2	7	7	7	9	12	12	16	5	14	13	

## 2. The nature of attitudes towards size

Informants of strong opinion—those who felt "very strongly" or "quite strongly" in favour of their local authority area either expanding, contracting or staying the same size—were next asked the reason(s) for their opinion.

The replies of informants who would prefer either a larger or smaller local authority area tend to reflect to some extent their opinions as to the present disadvantages or shortcomings of their local authority area, though this may be only an implication which we draw from a pattern of quite positive responses. It will be noted that these reasons are for a very large part concerned with the gains which would accrue to the present area (or to that part of it in which the informant lives) from the suggested expansion or contraction. Furthermore there is very little overt indication that social or personal ties of a community nature play any important part among the reasons they give for their attitude.



TABLE 154 (Q.38c)

## Reasons for being in favour of a bigger local authority area

<i>Base: (all strongly in favour of a bigger area)</i>	299
	%
Would improve facilities of present area	30
Would lead to (greater) functional efficiency (in administration)	22
Would allow for more housing space (for people in present area)	18
Would provide more industry and employment	9
Residents in surrounding areas share (our) facilities without paying our rates	9
Would mean lower rates (for present area)	7
With more people/greater population, more pressure could be brought to bear over local affairs	4
Surrounding area(s) should be able to share (our) facilities	3
Residents in surrounding areas have same interests/are part of the same community	1
Other reasons	2
Don't know/Q.N.A.	7

Apart from non-specific comments that their present local authority area is "too big already", over a third of those electors who wished for a smaller council area added another major explanation: that a contraction in size would allow for closer, more personal, more effective contact between residents in that (smaller) area and the council and their elected representatives:

TABLE 155 (Q.38c)

## Reasons for being in favour of a smaller local authority area

<i>Base: (all strongly in favour of a smaller area)</i>	73
	%
Would improve facilities; greater functional efficiency (in administration)	38
Would improve contact between council and residents; would allow more personal contact	34
Local authority covers too large an area at present	22
Outlying areas would be better joined to another authority	8
Would mean lower rates (for this part of the area)	7
This (part of the) local authority area is different from other parts of it	4
Political considerations and opinions	4
Other reasons	4
Don't know/Q.N.A.	4

Informants who preferred to see their local authority area remain the same size were most frequently inclined to say, simply, that it is "all right as it is". Neither expansion nor contraction would result, in the opinion of 18% of these informants, in greater efficiency—and might even lead to deterioration. The same argument applied to facilities in general for 11% of this group. The three other main arguments put forward by those who were against change (and, remember, this group was in a very substantial majority) were:

- considerations of community areas—though expressed negatively here in the alternative ideas that (a) “we have nothing to do with the surrounding areas and the people in them”, and (b) “our own community individuality would be lost in a larger unit”;
- the possibility of rate increases which might result from any sort of change;
- and despoliation of the surrounding countryside or green belt, if further urban development followed upon expansion of the council area.

TABLE 156 (Q.38c)

Reasons for being in favour of the local authority area remaining the same size

<i>Base: (all strongly in favour of the area remaining the same size)</i>		685
		%
Local authority area size satisfactory as it is now, (no further comments)		42
Functional efficiency would not improve/might worsen if size were altered		18
Community interest; no feeling of identification with the surrounding areas; we could lose our identity/individuality		12
Facilities would not improve/might worsen if size were altered		11
Rates would/might go up if local authority area became bigger or smaller		10
Would spoil the countryside, or encroach on it (if local authority area bigger)		9
The democratic process would not improve/might worsen if size were altered		5
Others would benefit from a change in size, not us		*
Other answers		*
Don't know/Q.N.A.		5

Dealing again only with those informants who claimed to hold their opinions “quite” strongly or “very” strongly—irrespective of whether they were in favour of expansion, contraction or maintenance of the present size—we put to them certain suggestions which might result from a size increase or decrease. These hypotheses, which are shown in Table 157, were presented to informants in a dichotomised form from which they were asked to select the answer which most appropriately represented their opinion.

The first item explores again the question of *efficiency* in administration. The weight of opinion of those who would advocate no change is, of course, evident here. While there appears to be a shared attitude that greater consequence for efficiency (either positive or negative) would result from an increase in size than would from a decrease (nearly a half of the informants thought no change in efficiency would result from contraction), the balance of opinion is that an increase would mean less efficiency in local government matters.

The second item, which is concerned implicitly with the subject of *accessibility* to local government in the form of reciprocal contact with people in the area, again shows fairly large proportions of informants who consider no change would result on this score from either expansion or contraction (39 % and 51 % respectively). Of the remainder, however, there is no doubt that the prevailing attitude is that an increase in size would make local government less “in touch” with the people of the area; conversely, though somewhat less emphatically, a decrease in size is thought to result in greater contact between local government and area residents.



TABLE 157 (Q.39a-c)

## Opinion as to the effects of expansion and contraction of the local authority area

Base: (all with strongly held opinions) (1057)	If local authority area were made:	
	Bigger	Smaller
	%	%
<i>Would make local government in this area:</i>		
More efficient	25	24
Less efficient	38	21
About the same	32	48
(Don't know)	5	6
<i>Would make local government in this area:</i>		
More "in touch" with the people in this council area	11	31
More "out of touch" with them	46	13
About the same	39	51
(Don't know)	4	5
<i>Would mean they (the local council) would be:</i>		
Able to get more done for the people in this area	27	32
Able to get less done for them	34	21
About the same	34	42
(Don't know)	5	5

The third item is involved with the potential *effectiveness* of the local council in these hypothesised situations. On this dimension there is a considerable difference of opinion, and this is very probably related to a division of ideas over the best means of promoting efficiency.\* Once again, substantial numbers of electors thought no change would result in this respect from either an increase or decrease in size. Of the remainder, there was a slight majority in favour of the opinion that more could be done for the people if the council area were made smaller, than if expansion took place. No doubt some feelings of concentration of resources, or of selectivity in their use, were present in these answers.

Feelings in favour of a smaller unit were more evident among informants living in conurbation county boroughs (see Table 158). R.D. dwellers also shared somewhat more frequently the idea that contraction would make for closer accessibility and greater effectiveness, though they were less emphatic about the effect of a decrease upon efficiency.

Throughout the commentary in this section upon opinions as to the likely effects of contraction or expansion—and particularly in the analysis contained in Table 158—we should bear in mind the smaller base numbers involved. These do not permit us a high degree of statistical confidence in the results thrown up, though we present the latter for their fundamental interest to the purpose of our study.

We should furthermore draw attention again to the fact that in almost all cases, a large proportion of the electors answering these questions was of the opinion that no change would result from either contraction or expansion (Table 157). Bearing in mind, too, that we are omitting from this analysis all those without strongly held opinions on the question of size, it will be seen that the differences upon which we are commenting are marginal indeed within the context of the entire electorate. If, therefore, among this small group there appears to be a slight predisposition to favour a smaller rather than a larger unit than at present,

\* Two views are inherent in replies to this section of the survey (at least, among those electors who hold strong opinions on the subject): that functional efficiency is only possible when the administrative unit is small and compact, operating on a "personal" basis; and the other that only with substantial resources, financial and territorial, can functional efficiency be achieved.



**TABLE 158 (Q.39a-c)**  
**Opinion as to the effects of expansion and contraction, by type and size of local authority**

<i>Base: (all with strongly held opinions)</i>	<i>C.B.</i>				<i>M.B./U.D.</i>					<i>R.D.</i>
	<i>Total</i> 339	<i>Conur- bation</i> 130	<i>250,000+</i> 78	<i>60,000- 250,000</i> 131	<i>Total</i> 477	<i>Conur- bation</i> 66	<i>60,000- 100,000</i> 133*	<i>30,000- 60,000</i> 148	<i>Up to 30,000</i> 211	<i>Total</i> 241
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<i>If local authority area were bigger:</i>										
More efficient	27	27	24	29	25	29	30	20	28	20
More "in touch"	10	8	10	13	10	14	14	7	11	12
Get more done	28	25	31	30	27	30	29	23	29	25
<i>If local authority area were smaller:</i>										
More efficient	31	38	31	23	19	20	18	21	20	27
More "in touch"	32	35	36	27	29	21	33	28	33	36
Get more done	34	41	33	27	27	26	26	26	32	37

\* Including supplementary sample.

we must refer again to the findings contained in Table 149; there, quite apart from the substantial majority either apathetic or in favour of no change, there is a clear majority which supports—overall—the idea of a bigger area, rather than a smaller one.

With a mind to the perceived effect upon community attachments within and between areas, we asked all informants what effect they thought an increase in the size of their local authority area would have upon co-operation or alternatively, rivalry, between the various areas which might then be comprised within it. Nearly a half of the total sample thought the increase would make no difference in this respect. Of the remainder there were marginally more of the opinion that greater rivalry would ensure than would co-operation:

**TABLE 159 (Q.40a)**  
**Effect of making local authority area bigger**

<i>(Base)</i>	2199
	%
Greater co-operation between the areas	15
Greater rivalry between the areas	22
No difference	48
Don't know/Q.N.A.	15

An opinion that rivalry would result from an increase was shown most obviously among residents in municipal boroughs and urban districts, and particularly among those living in the presently larger authorities (by population size) of this type:

**TABLE 160 (Q.40a)**  
**Opinion as to the effect of expansion, by type and size of local authority**

(Base)	C.B.				M.B./U.D.					R.D.
	Total 751	Conur- bation 294	250,000+ 206	60,000- 250,000 251	Total 910	Conur- bation 113	60,000- 100,000 235*	30,000- 60,000 288	Up to 30,000 417	Total 538
% considering greater rivalry would result	20%	21%	23%	17%	26%	31%	33%	26%	22%	19%

\* Including supplementary sample.

As might be expected, informants who scored highly on our index of knowledge of local government services had more definite opinions than did others on this question, but did not differ qualitatively from them in their answers to it.

We also asked informants directly what effects they thought an expansion of their respective local authority area would have upon life in their community. Again, among the relatively few informants who made constructive comments, responses are most frequently couched in terms of physical, material or functional effects rather than of more general consequences for community life, patterns of individual behaviour or the nature of ideas and people in the area:

TABLE 161 (Q.40b)  
Effects of expansion upon life in informant's community

Base: (2199)	Ameliorative effects	Adverse effects
	%	%
<i>Effects upon:</i>		
Availability/quality of facilities	13	3
Physical character of the area	1	3
Administration and functioning of the local authority	4	7
Community feeling	1	4
Local politics	*	1
Employment/industry/prosperity	2	*
Rates/rents	2	4
Ideas/outlook/scope of the people in the area/the type of people living in the area*	*	*
Other aspects†	*	1
No effects/would make no difference	40	
Don't know/Q.N.A.	19	

\* Comments included here were those on the type of person, now living outside the local authority area, who would be taken into the area as a result of expansion; also included were comments on the loss of "exclusivity", privacy and prestige.

† Two informants made objective, non-evaluative comments upon the consequences of expansion.

## Summary

1. Electors' opinions as to the optimum size of their local authority areas show a very marked preference for preserving the status quo.

2. The reasons given for keeping the present size are a mixture of satisfaction with the present system, and apprehension in the face of the consequences of any change. The latter comprises disbelief that change in the size of the area would lead to any functional, administrative or financial (i.e. rating) improvements, and fears that an *increased* size might have adverse effects upon community interests and, specifically, the surrounding countryside.

3. Reasons advanced in support of both an increase and a decrease in local authority area size are concerned very largely with the material gains which would accrue to the present area (or the electors' own part of it) from either sort of change.

4. Among those favouring a change, the balance of general opinion is clearly in support of a bigger authority area. Expansion is seen by those in favour of such a change as promoting greater efficiency and improving the facilities (especially in respect of housing) of the present area.

5. However, taking into consideration the views of all informants with fairly strongly-held opinions (irrespective of their basic attitude on this question), there is a slight balance of feeling that a *smaller* area would lead to improved accessibility and effectiveness. Many informants nevertheless consider that changes in the size of the authority area would have no consequences for either of these factors, nor for efficiency.

6. Nearly a half of the sample consider that an increase in the size of their present authority area would have no effect upon the degree of co-operation or rivalry between that area and the surrounding ones.

7. When directly considering any effects of expansion on life in their community, informants are more conscious of the physical, material, and functional consequences which might result, though over a half of all electors have no opinion, or consider expansion would have no effects upon the community.



## SECTION F

### ATTITUDES TOWARDS REPRESENTATION

#### Introduction

In this section of the survey, we report upon our study of electors' feelings on the subject of representation in an effort specifically to ascertain for the Commission whether the present territorial division of electoral areas (wards and parishes) in fact approximates to the perceived "ideal" size of area of representation. In studying a further aspect of the question of accessibility, we also report upon findings relating to informants' attitudes as to the proximity within which their local councillor should live.

#### 1. Optimum size of area of representation

We adopted for this part of the enquiry an approach similar to that employed earlier in the interview to probe informants' concept of "home" area; that is, getting them to describe the area of representation in terms of the places, districts, streets and so on which it would include. The form of the question was as follows:

Q.41a. "You probably know that councillors represent the people in a particular district. As far as you are concerned, which area would you *like* your local councillor to represent. I mean, how big or small an area around here should it be? (Which places/districts/streets should it include?)"

Perhaps the most suitable way to summarise the answers we obtained is as shown below:

TABLE 162 (Q.41a)  
Optimum size of area of representation (i)

(Base)	2199
	%
<i>Would like councillor to represent:</i>	
Area smaller than present ward/parish size	28
Ward/parish equivalent	37
Area larger than present ward/parish size	5
Don't know	28
Other answers/Q.N.A.	2

Thus, there is no absolute majority in favour of any one of these sizes, though the most frequently-mentioned category of response was that which favours the present size of division.\* The relatively large proportion of informants unable to express a preference may be alternatively taken as (a) a sign of apathy or lack of knowledge on the part of the electorate or (b) an indication of satisfaction with the present system.

One point is obvious, however, that there is no more than a very small minority of electors who would prefer to see councillors elected for an area greater in size than the present ward/parish equivalent. On the contrary, we can say that of all informants with an expressed opinion on this, more than nine in ten of them

\* In reaching this conclusion, we have in mind an "average" size of ward or parish. We have not attempted to relate this to the *actual* size of the informant's ward/parish. Thus, given that some variation occurs in the sizes of these local government divisions it is possible that this form of categorisation gives rise to discrepancies in individual circumstances. These should, however, cancel themselves out over the total sample.

(93%) feel that councillors should represent an area no larger than ward or parish size.

Noting firstly that the proportion of "don't know's" is by no means constant throughout the various sub-sections of our sample (it is slightly higher among those whom we have categorised on the "lower" level of education, and considerably higher among women, elderly informants (65+) and informants with less knowledge of local government), we can illustrate variations in the above general pattern for specific segments of the population whose views might be regarded as of interest:

TABLE 163 (Q.41a)  
Optimum size of area of representation (ii)

<i>Base: (all giving an answer in territorial terms)</i>		<i>Smaller than ward/parish</i>	<i>Ward/parish</i>	<i>Larger than ward/parish</i>	<i>Don't know/ Q.N.A./ Other answers*</i>	
		%	%	%	(Base)	%
<i>All informants</i>	(1525)	40	54	7	(2199)	31
<i>Sex:</i>						
Male	(806)	40	53	6	(1055)	24
Female	(719)	39	54	7	(1144)	37
<i>Age:</i>						
21-34	(383)	40	51	9	(524)	27
35-44	(314)	47	47	6	(444)	29
45-54	(334)	37	57	6	(447)	25
55-64	(281)	37	57	6	(395)	29
65+	(208)	37	58	6	(377)	45
Q.N.A.	(12)				(12)	
<i>Education:</i>						
Higher	(92)	30	63	7	(129)	29
Secondary	(309)	39	56	5	(448)	31
Lower	(1124)	41	52	7	(1622)	31
<i>Socio-economic status:</i>						
Group 1	(72)	32	60	8	(97)	26
2	(131)	32	64	4	(168)	22
3	(531)	39	55	7	(773)	31
4	(355)	42	50	8	(477)	26
5	(359)	43	50	6	(531)	32
Never employed/others	(77)	40	53	7	(153)	50
<i>Knowledge of local government:</i>						
"High" 7-9	(504)	40	56	4	(657)	23
↑ 5-6	(606)	39	54	7	(859)	29
"Low" Less than 5	(415)	40	50	10	(683)	39
<i>Type and size of local authority:</i>						
C.B.	Conurbation	44	54	2	(294)	26
	250,000+	48	46	6	(206)	41
	60,000-250,000	43	55	2	(251)	30
M.B./U.D.	Conurbation	30	66	4	(113)	30
	60,000-100,000	39	58	3	(235)†	20
	30,000-60,000	32	60	8	(288)	27
	Up to 30,000	41	49	10	(417)	34
R.D.		38	53	10	(538)	30

\* Percentages in this column are based on the total sample.

† Including supplementary sample.



We may note that preference for a *larger* area of representation was more frequent among informants with the least knowledge of local government. Conversely, preference for an area smaller than a ward or parish equivalent was more popular among informants of a lower socio-economic status and, related to this, those of a secondary or lower educational level. Those informants classified as "higher" in terms of education more frequently selected the existing size of division as their preference.

There was a greater preference for the smaller area among informants living in county boroughs, compared with those in municipal boroughs, urban districts and rural districts; electors in the latter types of authority were slightly more favourably inclined than county borough residents towards an area larger than a ward or parish.

All of these above variations should not detract, however, from the quite consistent overall conclusion that very few informants favoured an area larger than the present electoral division; of the remaining majority, opinion supporting an area of the present size was slightly more widespread than that in favour of a smaller size than this.

We asked informants\* to compare the area which they had described as the optimum size for their local councillor to represent with that which they had earlier defined as the "home" area. The extent to which rational considerations have been uppermost in their minds in determining the size of the area of representation (rather than thoughts as the exclusivity, homogeneity or unity of the area) will be shown below in informants' replies on their reasons for this choice; here we can see a reflection of that finding in the fact that no more than 39% of the entire sample described an area of the same size around their homes as a definition of both the community area and the "ideal" area of representation. Given that only three answers were possible, this figure is in real terms only a little above what one might expect from a purely chance distribution of replies (though statistically-speaking it exceeds it at a high level of significance):

TABLE 164 (Q.41c)  
Optimum size of area of representation, by adherence to "home" area

<i>Base: (all able to describe an area of representation)</i>	<i>Total</i> 1554	<i>Informants with "home" area</i> 1229	<i>Informants without "home" area</i> 325
<i>Optimum area of representation is:</i>	%	%	%
Larger than "home" area	31	30	36
Same size as "home" area	39	39	41
Smaller than "home" area	29	30	22
(Q.N.A.)	1	1	1

It will be remembered that informants who felt no sense of attachment to a "home" area had tended to describe that area in terms somewhat smaller than did those who were attached to the area. It is not surprising therefore that their definition of the optimum area of representation is conversely generally larger than that of their "home" area.

\* Excluding those who were unable to reply to Q.41a.



We may in fact analyse these answers in more detail according to the actual size of the "home" area as defined. In Table 165 we are concerned with area-adherents alone:

TABLE 165 (Q.41c)  
Optimum size of area of representation, by size of "home" area

Base (all with "home" area and answering Q.41a)	Size of "home" area						(Q.N.A.) (6)
	"Extended" 85	Town/city equiv. 190	Ward equiv. or larger 314	Part of ward 400	Parish equiv. 132	Part of parish 102	
Optimum area of representation is:	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Larger than "home" area	5	1	13	58	20	60	
Same size as "home" area	12	12	58	34	66	37	
Smaller than "home" area	83	86	28	7	14	3	

This analysis tends to confirm that there is little conscious correlation of the two types of area, and perhaps that an optimum size of representation is not based upon the same considerations as those which are operative in deciding upon the "home" area.

This conclusion is yet again underlined in the reasons given by informants for their choice of the most appropriate size for council representation:

TABLE 166 (Q.41b)  
Reasons for choice of size for area of representation (i)

Base: (all giving an answer at Q.41a)	1554
	%
Limitations on councillor's "work load", i.e. has enough to do, large enough area to cope with, canvassing, visiting, etc./can't spend any more time at it/as many as he can efficiently represent	51
Area reflects the extent to which councillor represents people he knows/is acquainted with/is part of/can personally contact	18
Limitations on extent to which elector can keep in touch with his representative	4
Area is the informant's community area, therefore councillor should represent that	4
Satisfactory/works quite well as it is now	14
Area should not be split up/should contain all sorts of people	1
Area should be compact/only one sort of person	1
Other reasons	1
Don't know/Q.N.A.	2

Over a half of the informants providing this information replied in "rational" terms, that is, they commented upon the functioning, scope and efficiency of the councillor's task. The second most frequent type of explanation was that contained in items two and three in the table which deal with accessibility. As can be seen, accessibility of the councillor to his constituents, rather than the other way

round, appeared to assume more importance here. Comments as to the "community" nature of the area of representation were confined to no more than 6%, if we combine items four, six and seven.

Reasons couched in terms of accessibility and the ability to maintain personal contact were much more frequently mentioned as explanations of the choice of a *smaller* area of representation, particularly by those informants whose optimum size was no larger than two or three streets around their homes. This is shown in Table 167, where for interest we also present again replies contained in the large category accounting for 51% of all responses to this question. A somewhat inconsistent pattern emerges in respect of this item.

TABLE 167 (Q.41b)  
Reasons for choice of size for area of representation (ii)

<i>Base:</i>	<i>Size of area of representation</i>			
	<i>Up to 2-3 streets</i>	<i>Larger group of streets (polling district)</i>	<i>Ward/ parish</i>	<i>Larger than ward/ parish</i>
	114	491	818	102
	%	%	%	%
Area reflects the extent to which councillor represents people he knows/is acquainted with/is part of/can personally contact	30	21	16	7
Limitations on extent to which elector can keep in touch with his representative	7	5	4	3
Limitations on councillor's workload, etc.	46	59	49	33

## 2. Residence of local councillor

As yet another aspect of the subject of accessibility to the local council and elected representatives, we asked informants their preference as to whether the councillor should live locally or whether alternatively they did not mind his not doing so. (If the Royal Commission were to recommend a basic electoral division of representation larger than the present ward/parish equivalent, the average geographical distance from constituents' to councillors' homes might increase).

Nearly two-thirds of the electors interviewed (65%) thought their councillor *should* live locally. Thirty-four per cent said they do not mind if he does not live in the vicinity.\*

There was a wider feeling that the councillor should live locally as one moves along the dimension from county boroughs, through smaller urban authorities, to rural districts:

TABLE 168 (Q.42)  
Attitude towards the location of councillor's residence, by type of local authority

<i>(Base)</i>	<i>C.B.</i>	<i>M.B./U.D.</i>	<i>R.D.</i>
	751	910	538
% who feel councillor <i>should</i> live locally	61%	64%	70%

\* The remaining 1% is made up of "don't know's" and a few informants who considered their councillor should *not* live locally.



There was a clear preference among the more highly educated electors, and those of higher socio-economic status, for the councillor to live locally. A complementary tendency was shown for disinterest in the matter to be associated with a lower grouping on these two indices:

TABLE 169 (Q.42)

Attitude towards the location of councillor's residence, by socio-economic status and education

(Base)	Socio-economic status						Education		
	1 97	2 168	Group 3 773	4 477	5 531	Never employed/ others 153	Higher 129	Secondary 448	Lower 1622
Should live locally	% 82	% 73	% 64	% 65	% 61	% 59	% 79	% 69	% 62
Do not care either way	16	25	34	34	37	39	20	29	36
D.K./other answers	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2

Finally, among informants who were able to conceive of a "home" area to which they belonged, there was a slight suggestion that preference for local residence by the councillor was greater among those visualising a larger "home" area:

TABLE 170 (Q.42)

Attitude towards the location of councillor's residence, by size of "home" area

(Base)	Total 1710	Informants with a "home" area					
		"Extended" area 110	Town/ city equiv. 264	Ward equiv. + 419	Part of ward 570	Parish equiv. 180	Part of parish 156
Should live locally	% 65	% 77	% 68	% 66	% 60	% 69	% 63
Do not care either way	33	23	31	32	39	29	35
D.K./other answers	2	—	1	2	1	2	2

### Summary

1. The majority of electors favours the present size of the area of representation, i.e. an area the size of a ward or parish. Among the remaining electors a smaller area of representation than this is more popular than a larger one.

2. There is little conscious correlation between informants' conceived "home" area and the area they choose as most appropriate for the purpose of representation in local government. The reasons given for choosing the size of the area of representation are largely concerned with limitations upon the individual councillor's "work-load" and considerations of the amount of work/number of constituents he can effectively represent.

3. Nearly two-thirds of the electors think their local councillor ought to live locally. Nearly all the remaining electors do not mind if their councillor is not a local resident.



## SECTION G

### FACTOR ANALYSIS OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT AND CONCLUSIONS

#### Introduction

In Section B of this report we noted that we should wish to investigate intensively the special nature of a person's links with his or her "home" community area; we should aim to ascertain which aspects of life are most important in contributing towards an individual's potentiality for involvement in his or her community. It is this particular aim, and the analyses carried out to investigate it, upon which we comment in the first part of this section. We investigate the concept of community involvement, and show how there are, in fact, different *types* of involvement. We further proceed to analyse some of the main areas of study in the enquiry in terms of a categorisation of electors on scales of involvement.

In the latter part of this section, we draw together some of the other main threads which seem to run through the results of the survey, and which may assist us in arriving at some general conclusions from it.

#### 1. Factor Analysis of Community Involvement

The method we used to explore involvement with the community, termed factor analysis, may be stated quite simply: it evaluates responses to a number of questions, all of which may initially and hypothetically be regarded as touching upon, or indicating, several aspects of community life; starting from a correlation matrix of such questions, it clusters together certain sets of these indicators, and measures the contribution which each indicator (or question) makes to each cluster (or factor) produced. This contribution is termed the loading, and it is by investigating the value of the loadings that we can give a meaning to each factor. Each factor accounts for a certain proportion of the total variance in the data, so we can therefore say how important that factor is. Finally, the analysis allows us to categorise individual informants in terms of their strength of involvement on each factor.

We outline the several stages of this analysis in more detail in Appendix D.

Before commenting upon the results of this exercise, we should sound one note of caution which might apply in the use or interpretation of these results. In identifying different aspects or types of community involvement, we should remember that these do not necessarily explain or account for the special nature of any particular person's commitment to his community. They do not necessarily relate to the quality of involvement on an *individual* level. (For example, it is possible that a person might feel highly involved with his "home" area purely as a result of a strong attachment to one particular local organisation). The factors which were derived from this analysis are merely the most significant ones; that is to say, they account for the largest proportions of the total variance among the entire sample.

##### (i) *The factors identified*

We isolated three factors of involvement, all of which were significantly correlated with two questions (Q.2 and Q.10) which were, *prima facie*, the best available indicators of identification with the "home" area. Question 2, it will be remembered, ascertained whether there was a "home" area to which the informant considered he or she belonged; Question 10 established how sorry or pleased the informant might be to leave that area. The three factors were:

### Factor 1. "Social attachment"

The variables comprising this factor deal predominantly with the numbers (and proportions) of relatives and acquaintances whom the informant has living within his community area. Specifically, these are, in descending order of their importance as contributors to this factor:

- (Q.13a) The proportion of adult relatives and in-laws living in informant's "home" area;
- (Q.12a) The number of adult relatives and in-laws living within ten minutes' walk from informant's home;
- (Q.14a) The proportion of adult friends living in informant's "home" area;
- (Q.4a) Length of residence in the "home" area;
- (Q.11) The number of people living in the "home" area whom the informant knows; and
- (Q.12b) The number of adult friends living within ten minutes' walk from informant's home.

It will be seen that this factor is concerned with essentially *passive* characteristics of involvement. It relates almost entirely to patterns of kinship, extended relationship and acquaintance.

As an "explanation" of community involvement, this factor was statistically about twice as important as—

### Factor 2. "Interest in local affairs"

The variables which were found to be comprised within this factor indicate a far more active form of involvement. However, judging from their particular nature, this activity is, in itself, of a quite specific variety. It is that which relates to an interest in the running of local government and participation in public service of a local nature. In order of decreasing importance as contributors to Factor 2, the variables concerned are:

- (Q.32) Interest in taking an active part in the running of local government;
- (Q.8) Interest in what goes on in the "home" area;
- (Q.33a, b) Holding of positions in public service of a local nature; and
- (Q.11) The number of people living in the "home" area whom the informant knows.

### Factor 3. "Employment/Conviviality"

The third factor identified was barely acceptable in terms of statistical significance as an explanation of our best available general indicators, Questions 2 and 10. It comprises only two variables:

- (Q.15a, c) Employment within the "home" area; and
- (Q. 19a, b, e) Informant visits a "local" public house in "home" area.

It is difficult to explain as an aspect of community involvement—as much because of the variables which are *not* related to it as because of those which are. If, for example, variables which describe the numbers of friends the informant has were shown to be connected to this, we may then have been



able to infer a meaning to this factor. This was not shown however: the loadings for each of the variables of this type were extremely low on Factor 3. Indeed, the third most important contributor to the factor (and the only other one of any note at all) was Q.18a/c—attendance at a place of worship in the “home” area.

With relatively low significance, then, compared with the first two factors, and hypothesising that Factor 3 may well be a function of a completely separate variable, such as socio-economic status, we rejected this Employment/Conviviality factor in the subsequent analysis.

The scales for each factor take the form of a six-fold categorisation, the groups arranged along a “low” to “high” dimension. All informants,\* including those in the supplementary sample, therefore have an individual classification on each of the two factors. The categorisations are derived from analyses of the distribution of scores of the entire sample. These are ranged round a nil mean and extend from  $-2.0$  to over  $+3.0$  standard deviations for the Social Attachment factor, and from  $-2.2$  to over  $+3.0$  standard deviations for the Interest in Local Affairs factor. A summary of the scores, containing the groupings arrived at, is shown below:

TABLE 171  
Distribution of sample by factor scores

	Social attachment			Interest in local affairs	
	Natural samples	Natural sample		Natural samples	Natural sample
	2342	2199		2342	2199
“Scores” (standard deviations):	No.	No.	“Scores” (standard deviations):	No.	No.
“High” Over $+1.5$	237	230	“High” Over $+1.3$	201	190
↑ Over $+0.8$ to $+1.5$	222	213	↑ Over $+0.7$ to $+1.3$	201	186
Over $+0.4$ to $+0.8$	215	202	Over $+0.2$ to $+0.7$	334	306
Over $-0.1$ to $+0.4$	375	357	Over $-0.2$ to $+0.2$	419	388
↓ Over $-0.5$ to $-0.1$	357	324	↓ Over $-0.5$ to $-0.2$	315	296
“Low” Up to $-0.5$	936	873	“Low” Up to $-0.5$	872	833

These groups constitute the categories of analysis which are used throughout this section.

It will be seen from the distributions shown in Table 171 that, speaking in absolute terms, relatively few informants can be said to be highly involved on either factor scale. By far the largest category, numerically, of the six we have employed is that which contains the most lowly involved informants. We shall further see in the analyses which follow that crucial variations often occur only between the one (or, sometimes, the two) highest categories of involvement and the remainder of the sample. In reporting this we should therefore remember that the group to which we are referring constitutes only about one in ten of the total sample.

\* One informant alone was not classified. For the sake of simplicity of presentation, she has been assigned a median value on each scale and included in the subsequent analyses.



Table 172 below, which contains a cross-analysis of responses on the two factors, illustrates the degree of "separateness" between them. In fact, a certain elliptical relationship appears to exist, with informants in the middle score categories on the Social Attachment factor tending slightly to have somewhat higher-than-average scores on the Interest factor.

TABLE 172  
Cross-analysis of the two factors

		<i>Social attachment</i>					
		"Low" ← <i>Groups</i> → "High"					
<i>Base:</i>		1	2	3	4	5	6
		873	324	357	202	213	230
<i>Interest in local affairs:</i>		%	%	%	%	%	%
<div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="margin-right: 10px;"> "Low" ↑ ↓ "High" </div> <div> Groups 1 2 3 4 5 6 </div> </div>	1	47	36	23	23	36	45
	2	12	13	19	16	9	12
	3	17	16	21	26	16	12
	4	11	15	15	14	17	17
	5	6	12	12	8	10	7
	6	7	7	10	13	12	7

The fact that these two factors are quite discrete can be shown in the value of the correlation coefficient for the above matrix, which is

$$r = +0.05$$

Thus, we confirm that we are dealing with two separate forms of categorisation of informant.

## (ii) Demographic profiles

Table 173 illustrates in detailed form a profile of each of the factor categories in terms of a number of standard demographic variables. It may be summarised as follows:

- *Sex*: Men are more highly involved than women on both factor-scales, but this is especially evident in the Interest aspect of community.
- *Age*: The more highly involved informants on the Interest factor show an overall tendency to be older than the average informant. There is no very consistent relationship between scores on the Social Attachment scale and age, although there is a marked concentration of very young informants (21-34) in the highest category on this scale.
- *Education*: The higher the grade of education, the lower the level of involvement in terms of social attachment but, conversely, the higher the level of involvement in terms of interest in local affairs.
- *Employment*: Reflecting, no doubt, the tendency for higher involvement to be concentrated more among men, we see also that the high score group on the Interest factor contains a greater proportion of employed, rather than non-employed informants. There is no straight-forward linear relationship between Social Attachment scores and working status.
- *Socio-economic status*: The most highly involved groups on the Interest scale contain much larger-than-average representation of the highest

TABLE 173  
Factor profiles

(Base)	All informants 2199	Social attachment						Interest in local affairs					
		"Low" ← "High"						"Low" ← "High"					
		873	324	357	202	213	230	833	296	388	306	186	190
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Sex:													
Male	48	47	45	42	47	55	59	41	46	51	51	51	66
Female	52	53	55	58	53	45	41	59	54	49	49	49	34
Age:													
21-34	24	25	23	21	21	19	30	26	25	26	22	21	15
35-44	20	24	15	19	15	21	19	21	15	21	24	15	20
45-54	20	23	19	19	15	23	18	19	18	20	22	26	22
55-64	18	14	21	22	22	18	20	16	24	17	19	19	20
65+	17	13	23	18	27	19	12	17	19	16	13	19	22
Q.N.A.	1	1	*	1	*	—	1	1	*	*	*	—	1
Education:													
Higher	6	9	6	5	3	4	2	3	5	5	6	10	15
Secondary	20	26	17	20	14	16	12	17	15	23	23	21	34
Lower	74	65	77	75	83	80	86	80	81	72	71	69	51
Employment:													
Over 30 hours per week	52	57	48	43	45	52	57	47	48	57	60	50	58
Under 30 hours per week	10	11	8	14	6	12	7	10	9	10	8	12	13
Non-working	38	32	44	43	49	36	36	43	43	33	32	38	29
Socio-economic status:													
Group 1	4	7	3	2	2	4	3	3	2	4	5	4	17
2	8	8	7	7	9	5	10	5	6	8	11	9	14
3	35	39	39	37	26	31	26	37	30	34	38	37	32
4	22	19	23	20	20	31	24	21	25	21	21	21	20
5	24	21	21	27	31	23	32	26	30	26	20	21	13
Never employed/others	7	6	7	7	12	6	5	8	8	7	5	8	4
Distance from town hall:													
Up to ¼ mile	5	3	5	5	8	10	7	4	4	6	6	6	7
¼-½ mile	10	8	10	10	9	12	12	10	9	14	8	4	11
½-1 mile	18	17	16	19	14	21	24	19	14	19	21	16	15
1-1½ miles	11	13	13	11	11	10	8	12	12	10	12	15	7
1½-2 miles	15	17	14	15	14	10	13	15	17	15	15	12	15
2-3 miles	14	14	15	14	14	13	12	15	11	12	14	17	13
3+ miles	26	27	25	25	28	22	22	24	31	24	23	28	31
Q.N.A.	1	1	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	*	1	2	1

S.E.G. groups, 1 and 2. Conversely, they also contain relatively fewer informants from the lowest S.E.G., group 5. This latter group, on the other hand, makes up a somewhat larger proportion of the high-score category on the Social Attachment scale.

— *Distance from town hall:* There is a slight tendency for residence to be closer to the centre of the local authority area among those most highly involved in terms of Social Attachment. There is little consistent variation in factor scores on the Interest scale in terms of distance of residence from the centre.

To put all these variations in a nutshell, we may say that the informant who is

most highly involved with his community area in a way described by the Social Attachment factor is more likely to be:

- male,
- very young (i.e. 21-34),
- of a lower level of education,
- of a lower socio-economic status, and
- resident closer to the centre of the local authority area.

The highly-involved informant on the scale relating to interest in local affairs is also more likely to be male, but otherwise—when compared with the profile of the entire sample—leans towards a different description:

- elderly,
- of a higher or secondary level of education,
- employed, either full- or part-time (rather than non-working), and
- of a higher socio-economic status.

Whilst this analysis allows us to present the segments of the population among whom people possessing various degrees of involvement may be more heavily concentrated, an alternative form of presentation enables us to illustrate the degree of involvement shown by informants living in areas of different types:

TABLE 174  
Community involvement, by type of local authority

(Base)	Type of local authority		
	C.B. 751	M.B./U.D. 910	R.D. 538
<i>Social Attachment:</i>			
%			
"Low" Group 1	42	37	41
↕ 2/3	32	30	31
4	8	9	11
↕ 5	9	11	9
"High" 6	9	13	10
<i>Interest in local affairs:</i>			
%			
"Low" Group 1	41	39	32
↕ 2/3	31	30	34
4	15	15	11
↕ 5	8	7	10
"High" 6	5	9	13

Thus, while there is relatively little difference overall between informants in these three types of authority area, it is still evident that the shared degree of involvement in terms of social attachment is somewhat higher among informants in small urban authorities. It is residents in rural districts, however, who display a quite evidently higher degree of involvement as measured by the Interest scale. Bearing in mind the variables comprising this latter factor, this quite naturally repeats earlier findings relating to these informants.

An analysis in terms of population size (in urban authority areas) reveals few differences between the various divisions. The major variation from the average clearly occurs among residents in the smallest urban local authority areas, those



of less than 30,000 population, who show a somewhat higher degree of social attachment than does the rest of the sample:

TABLE 175  
Community involvement, by size of (urban) authority area

(Base)	C.B.			M.B./U.D.			
	Conur- bation 294	250,000+ 206	60,000- 250,000 251	Conur- bation 113	60,000- 100,000 235*	30,000- 60,000 288	Up to 30,000 417
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<i>Social attachment:</i>							
“Low” Group 1	42	45	40	41	46	42	31
↕ 2/3	33	34	30	32	33	33	28
4	8	7	8	11	8	8	10
5	9	7	13	6	6	9	14
“High” 6	9	7	9	10	7	8	17
<i>Interest in local affairs:</i>							
“Low” Group 1	38	48	39	41	34	39	37
↕ 2/3	30	25	34	29	34	29	31
4	19	13	11	15	18	16	14
5	8	9	9	5	8	9	8
“High” 6	4	5	7	10	6	7	10

\* Including supplementary sample.

Analysing rural district residents in terms of an index of population stability for their respective parishes, we see that higher involvement on both factor scales is shown more particularly in areas of declining population:

TABLE 176  
Community involvement in rural districts, by population stability

(Base)	Population stability		
	Decrease or nil change 194	Up to 2% increase 152	Over 2% increase 192
	%	%	%
<i>Social attachment:</i>			
“Low” Group 1	36	45	42
↕ 2/3	28	31	33
4	14	11	7
5	10	5	9
“High” 6	12	7	9
<i>Interest in local affairs:</i>			
“Low” Group 1	26	38	33
↕ 2/3	34	34	33
4	13	10	10
5	10	7	11
“High” 6	17	11	12

Analysis of these factors carried out in terms of population density shows that areas of greatest rurality (less than 1 per person per acre) exhibit a markedly larger proportion of informants scoring highly on the Interest factor. Conversely the

respective proportions of high-interest electors are considerably smaller in the most densely populated areas:

TABLE 177  
Community involvement, by population density

(Base)	Persons per acre					
	0-1	Over 1 to 5	Over 5 to 10	Over 10 to 15	Over 15 to 20	Over 20
	307	517	365	380	242	388
<i>Interest in local affairs:</i> (High) Group 6	18%	7%	10%	8%	5%	4%

(iii) *Re-analysis of factor variables*

We have earlier listed the main variables which comprise the two factors. The factor loading of each variable—which is shown in Appendix D—indicates statistically its relative importance as a contributor to the factor concerned. In this part we wish briefly to re-examine certain crucial indicators in respect of responses on the two factor scales. It will be seen that confirmation of their contribution to each factor is shown in the evident correlation which exists. Since the factors are in fact merely the expression of a summary value for a number of these variables, such correlation (or lack of it) in respect of individual variables is to be expected. It is the nature and the significance of the correlation which is of interest.

(a) "Direct", subjective indicators

TABLE 178

(Base)	Social attachment						Interest in local affairs					
	"Low" ←			→ "High"			"Low" ←			→ "High"		
	873	324	357	202	213	230	833	296	388	306	186	190
(Q.2) With "home" area	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Without "home" area	63	80	86	91	91	91	70	80	78	85	85	89
	36	20	14	9	9	9	30	19	22	15	15	11
(Q.8) Very interested in what goes on in "home" area	18	20	21	20	24	26	*	5	7	46	69	72
(Q.10) Very sorry to leave "home" area	28	41	44	50	55	61	34	39	37	48	52	58

It is informants in the two lowest categories of Social Attachment, but particularly those in the lowest of the six, who show a much weaker tendency than the others to be able to conceptualise a "home" area to which they belong. Well over a third of the informants in this lowest score group do not think of a home area in this way. A similar pattern of correlation between the various score categories and responses to Question 2 is visible in respect of the second factor scale, Interest in Local Affairs.

A reply of "very interested in what goes on in the 'home' area" at Question 8 barely differentiates at all between high and low involvement in respect of Social Attachment. In other words, greater social attachment to the "home" area can not be said substantially to increase interest in the affairs of that area. Since the second factor comprises Question 8 as one of its contributory variables, the positive correlation between the two is essential. This difference between the two scales illustrates that Question 8 can not be regarded as a *general* indicator of community involvement, as can Questions 2 and 10. It is measuring something rather more specific.

There are evident significant variations between highly- and lowly-involved informants, on both scales, in terms of their proclivity to respond "very sorry to leave" the "home" area at Question 10. The pattern of correlation is similar on the two scales.

(b) "*Indirect*", *behavioural indicators*. Table 179 contains a break-down of a number of behavioural variables in terms of both factor scales. We may comment briefly upon each one:

- *Length of residence*: Eighty-eight per cent of the most highly-involved group in terms of Social Attachment have lived in the "home" area for more than twenty years. Over a half were born in the area. There is some slight indication that length of residence is greater than on average among informants high on the Interest factor, but this is a little tenuous, and we should not conclude that the two are closely related.
- *Indices of kinship and acquaintance*: As would be expected, these all show strong lines of correlation with the Social Attachment factor, to which they make significant contributions. The most important variable in this respect, as we have earlier noted, is the *proportion* of relatives who live in the informant's "home" area. This is clearly a most useful indicator to involvement of this type. Interest in Local Affairs shows no consistent correlation with those variables which are concerned with relatives and in-laws, but does suggest a connection with patterns of friendship and acquaintance.
- *Employment in the "home" area*: This variable does show some correlation with both factors, but we have seen from the analysis itself that it goes to constitute a separate factor of involvement in itself.
- *Amount of time spent in "home" area*: On both factors, but particularly Social Attachment, informants with a higher degree of involvement on average spend more of their leisure time within the "home" area. A circular process of explanation may well be applicable here: do they spend more time there because they are involved with the area for other primary reasons; or do they become involved because they spend more time there? The results of the factor analysis tend to suggest the first of these alternatives.
- *Local newspaper readership*: Regular readership of at least two local newspapers (a more rigorous index than that relating to one newspaper alone) is linked far more positively to involvement of the Interest type than it is to Social Attachment.
- *Organisation membership*: A similar comment to the above may be made on an index of club and organisation membership based upon at least two such bodies in the "home" area, though a clear tendency to multiple membership is shown with increasing involvement on both factor-scales. Exactly a half of all those most highly involved on the Interest factor belong to two or more organisations in their respective "home" areas.



TABLE 179

## Analysis of involvement groups in terms of miscellaneous behavioural indices

Base)	Social attachment						Interest in local affairs					
	"Low" 873	324	357	202	213	"High" 230	"Low" 833	296	388	306	186	"High" 190
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Q.4a) Length of residence in "home" area:												
Up to 3 years	27	14	9	5	4	3	19	15	15	12	15	6
Over 3-10 years	36	21	19	6	10	3	25	20	23	24	16	18
Over 10-20 years	29	18	18	9	11	6	18	23	21	21	17	21
Over 20 years	6	38	36	56	36	36	22	26	26	24	30	36
Born here	2	9	18	24	39	52	16	16	14	19	22	19
(Q.11) Know very many people in "home" area	9	35	50	58	64	75	13	35	40	56	61	73
(Q.12a) Have no relatives living within ten minutes' walk	71	59	47	36	15	4	48	51	49	47	54	53
(Q.12b) Have more than six friends living within ten minutes' walk	20	38	56	61	61	74	21	43	51	57	61	71
(Q.13a) Most or all of relatives live in "home" area	—	—	5	15	48	91	22	12	11	16	11	17
(Q.14a) Most or all of friends live in "home" area	5	31	57	72	77	87	31	43	38	46	48	52
(Q.15a) Employed in "home" area and do not usually travel outside	8	14	16	13	23	26	10	15	14	16	19	18
(Q.16) Usually spend more than 3 hours in "home" area on:												
Sundays	9	12	17	14	26	36	10	13	17	18	22	33
Saturdays	12	15	20	24	35	42	15	16	23	21	30	34
Weekdays	6	12	19	26	26	35	9	15	15	24	21	27
(Q.9) Read 2 or more local newspapers regularly	32	34	36	40	39	44	24	33	41	44	49	55
(Q.17) Belong to 2 or more clubs/organisations in "home" area	11	15	20	20	25	26	7	11	13	24	31	50
(Q.20) Have children at school in "home" area	17	16	20	15	23	23	18	16	19	24	15	20
(Q.22) Have access to a private telephone at home	36	31	28	19	18	14	23	24	27	34	31	49
(Q.23c) Have a main weekly shopping expedition:												
In "home" area	23	26	27	32	38	37	24	25	28	30	35	36
Outside "home" area	40	32	27	22	19	17	36	30	30	28	23	23
(Q.21a, b) Do not have a motor vehicle	36	42	50	51	53	50	44	49	47	38	44	32
Have a motor vehicle and use outside "home" area at least 2-3 times per week	39	32	24	19	21	20	29	25	29	31	35	36
(Q.24) No. of entertainments in "home" area:												
Nil	63	57	53	53	43	36	64	62	52	45	40	38
1	24	27	27	24	28	33	28	24	25	27	32	19
2 or more	13	16	20	23	29	31	8	14	23	28	28	43
(Q.32) Ever been interested in taking an active part in running local government ("Yes" at all at Q.32b-e) On local council	7 6	5 4	4 3	5 3	6 5	5 3	* —	1 —	1 —	3 1	5 2	52 50
(Q.33) Participated at all in positions of local public service	10	9	7	6	9	8	3	3	5	8	19	42

— *Children at school in "home" area:* There is no significant evidence that having children at school in the "home" area affects in any way the degree of involvement on either of these factors.

— *Access to a private telephone:* The hypothesis that having access to a telephone at home may negatively affect the degree of involvement appears

to be quite well substantiated, for the Social Attachment factor at least. The apparent converse trend shown on the Interest in Local Affairs factor is influenced without doubt by the social class variation in telephone-ownership.

- *Shopping*: While there is a slight but clearly observable tendency for the more highly involved, on both factors, to undertake a major weekly shopping expedition within the defined "home" area, the data tend to suggest alternatively that the main effect on this variable is a negative one: that is, that undertaking the shopping journey *outside* the "home" area decreases the degree of involvement. This is more especially true of involvement on the Social Attachment factor.
- *Use of a motor vehicle*: A hypothesis that geographical mobility resulting from access to and use of a car might, again, loosen ties with the community area and therefore degree of involvement with it appears to be supported somewhat in respect of the factor of Social Attachment. Both ownership and frequency of use are higher among those informants at the lower end of this factor scale. The converse appears to be true, however, with regard to Interest in Local Affairs, though a social class effect in the ownership of cars is very probably again operating to negate any correlation which may exist.
- *Leisure activities/entertainments*: The extent to which these are pursued within the "home" area is very evidently related in a positive fashion with degree of involvement on both factors of community.
- *Activity in public affairs*: Not surprisingly, this shows an extremely close correlation with the factor scale which is based upon the variables dealing with this. It may be noted that almost all informants who *have* been interested in the running of local government (by any of the four criteria which we itemised in the questionnaire) are classified as members of the group with the highest degree of involvement on the Interest factor. Approximately a half of the informants in this highest group, in fact, have participated in local government, and 42% in public service of a local nature. There is no correlation between these variables on their own and the Social Attachment factor.

(iv) *Analyses of survey data by involvement groups*

Analyses by these two factors of community involvement provide a useful way of looking at the important issues covered by the survey questionnaire. Each of these issue-areas has been dealt with in earlier sections of the report; here we expand that commentary to explore the characteristics and opinions in each respect of two key groups—those informants who have been classified as highly involved on each factor-scale.

(a) *Extent and nature of "home" area*. We have already confirmed the expected variation between low and high-score informants in terms of the extent to which they feel a sense of belonging to the area in which they live. Here we wish to investigate the perceived *extent* of that area for highly-involved adherents. As Table 180 illustrates, on both factor scales these groups tend to share a considerably wider vision of their community area than the rest of the sample. Thus, while only 17% of those with a low degree of Social Attachment conceptualise an area roughly the equivalent of local authority area size or larger, 36% of the highly-involved informants on this scale do so. Similarly, taking the factor of Interest in Local Affairs, 19% of the low-scoring group visualise a "home" area of this size while 34% of the high-score group do so.



TABLE 180  
Community involvement, and size of "home" area

<i>Base (informants with a "home" area at Q.2)</i>	<i>Social attachment</i> "Low" ↔ "High"		<i>Interest in local affairs</i> "Low" ↔ "High"	
	<i>Groups</i> 1-4 1306	<i>Groups</i> 5-6 404	<i>Groups</i> 1-4 1382	<i>Groups</i> 5-6 328
	%	%	%	%
"Extended" area	5	10	4	15
Town/city equivalent	12	26	15	19
Ward equivalent or larger	24	25	25	24
Part of ward	37	22	36	20
Parish	10	11	10	15
Part of parish	10	5	10	7
Q.N.A.	*	1	1	*

There is little variation of an outstanding and consistent nature between the ways in which the highly-involved informants see their "home" area (the differences between it and surrounding areas) and those who score less highly on the two scales. The two tables following (Tables 181 and 182) document replies to

TABLE 181  
Community involvement, and differences between "home" and surrounding areas

<i>(Base)</i>	<i>Social attachment</i> "Low" ↔ "High"		<i>Interest in local affairs</i> "Low" ↔ "High"	
	<i>Groups</i> 1-5 1969	<i>Group</i> 6 230	<i>Groups</i> 1-5 2009	<i>Group</i> 6 190
	%	%	%	%
"Nicer" area physically	28	22	27	29
Worse area physically	5	3	5	5
Plenty of facilities	4	7	4	5
Lack of facilities	5	4	4	6
Plenty of industry/employment	*	1	*	2
Lack of industry/employment	*	2	*	1
Objective descriptions of area	12	14	12	19
<i>In "home" area:</i>				
More select/higher class/better class of people	6	3	6	4
Worse class of people	3	1	3	3
People friendlier	6	7	5	9
People less friendly	2	1	2	3
Younger	1	—	*	1
Older	1	—	1	1
"Nicer"	1	*	1	2
Not so nice	*	—	*	—
Different jobs/different nationality	1	*	1	2
Other (favourable) comments on people	1	2	1	—
Other (unfavourable) comments on people	1	—	*	—
Other ways	3	6	3	4
Don't know/Q.N.A.	1	*	1	—
No differences	40	45	42	31



TABLE 182

## Community involvement, and differences between the people in "home" and surrounding areas

(Base)	Social attachment "Low" ↔ "High"		Interest in local affairs "Low" ↔ "High"	
	Groups 1-5	Group 6	Groups 1-5	Group 6
	1969	230	2009	190
	%	%	%	%
Friendlier	15	22	15	21
Not so friendly	10	4	9	13
Younger	1	1	1	1
Older	2	2	2	4
"Nicer"	4	6	4	5
Not so nice	2	*	2	1
Higher social class/more select	9	4	9	9
Lower social class/less select	5	1	4	4
Different jobs	1	1	*	2
Not local people	1	*	1	2
Independent/narrow-minded	1	1	1	4
Other (favourable) comments	1	3	1	1
Other (unfavourable) comments	1	—	1	—
Objective descriptions of people	1	3	2	2
Other answers	1	1	1	4
Don't know/Q.N.A.	*	*	*	1
No differences	53	58	55	42

these questions (6 and 7) analysed in terms of factor scores. We would make the following comments in summary:

- while there is a slight tendency for those with a high degree of Social Attachment to be able less often to see a difference between the "home" and surrounding areas, the converse applies on the other factor where the *least* involved are the ones who report fewer differences. Higher involvement in terms of Interest also seems to enhance a little an ability to differentiate between the *residents* of the "home" area and its surroundings.
- informants in the highest group in respect of Interest are considerably more likely to quote what we have termed "sociability" distinctions between residents in the different areas (and particularly the friendliness of "home" area residents), rather than "status" distinctions. Informants with a high degree of Social Attachment less often conceptualise differences in status terms than do those who are not so strongly involved on this factor scale.

(b) *Knowledge of Local Public Services.* There is no significant indication that the Social Attachment factor discriminates at all significantly on the dimension of knowledge of local public services. (See Table 183).

There is some suggestion, however, of an association between involvement on the Interest factor scale and average number of correct replies: we put our conclusion no higher than this in view of the small base numbers involved in this analysis and the not entirely consistent pattern of association. (See Table 184).

TABLE 183

## Social attachment, and knowledge of local public services

(Base)	Social attachment					
	"Low" 873	324	357	202	213	"High" 230
	%	%	%	%	%	%
<i>Knowledge of local government services:</i>						
(High) 8-9 correct	13	13	11	11	14	11
7 correct	19	16	17	12	18	19
6 correct	19	21	21	22	24	19
5 correct	19	16	19	19	17	23
3-4 correct	24	23	23	27	20	23
(Low) Less than 3 correct	6	11	9	9	7	5

TABLE 184

## Interest in local affairs and knowledge of local public services, by type of local authority

	(Base)	Average number of correct answers
C.B.	"High" Interest (39)	6.9
	↑ (64)	6.6
	(111)	6.5
	↓ (124)	6.6
	"Low" Interest (105)	6.2
M.B./U.D.	(308)	6.2
	"High" Interest (79)	5.8
	↑ (69)	5.6
	(134)	5.2
	↓ (166)	5.2
R.D.	"Low" Interest (108)	5.2
	(354)	4.9
	"High" Interest (72)	4.7
	↑ (53)	4.4
	(61)	4.6
	↓ (98)	4.2
	(83)	4.4
	"Low" Interest (171)	3.9

(c) *Attitudes towards the local provision of public services.* The factor of social attachment is shown to have no bearing upon the quality of attitudes, favourable or unfavourable, towards the provision of local government services.

The second factor, however, clearly does. There is some indication that electors with high scores on this factor scale share an enhanced tendency to be able to quote services, both those which are felt to be well-run and those which are not. This reflects, no doubt, a more intense interest in local authority affairs on the part of the highly-involved. (See Table 185).

TABLE 185

Interest in local affairs, and favourable and unfavourable attitudes towards the local provision of public services

(Base)	Interest in local affairs "Low" ← → "High"	
	Groups 1-4 1823	Groups 5-6 376
	%	%
<i>Services which are well run (Q.26):</i>		
None	29	18
One	25	25
More than one	46	57
<i>Services which are not very well run (Q.27):</i>		
None	50	41
One	31	32
More than one	19	27

(d) *Hypothesised approaches to offices and officials.* There are few outstanding differences of great magnitude between informants of high and low community involvement in respect of their opinions as to the optimum contact through which to channel complaints or enquiries. Nevertheless certain variations are noticeable, as can be seen from Table 186:

TABLE 186

Community involvement, and hypothesised first contact to resolve an enquiry/complaint

(Base)	Social attachment "Low" ← → "High"						Interest in local affairs "Low" ← → "High"					
	873	324	357	202	213	230	833	296	388	306	186	190
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<i>First contact:</i>												
The "council"/local council/ town hall	33	26	38	35	37	33	36	33	38	30	29	21
Town council	5	5	3	1	1	1	3	3	4	3	3	4
Council department concerned/ head of council department	31	33	29	28	27	24	26	28	26	35	35	39
Any office or official	69	64	70	63	65	58	66	63	69	68	68	63
M.P.	3	2	3	4	4	6	3	4	3	5	2	3
County councillor	1	1	—	3	*	*	1	*	1	*	1	1
Local councillor	9	11	13	14	15	19	10	12	11	13	16	16
Parish councillor	1	1	1	3	*	3	1	1	1	—	2	3
Any elected representative	13	15	17	23	20	28	15	17	17	18	20	23
Citizens' Advice Bureau	3	3	1	2	2	1	2	3	2	3	3	2
Other answers	6	6	5	1	7	6	5	6	5	7	5	10
Don't know/Q.N.A.	8	11	7	10	7	7	13	11	7	4	4	2



The most important of these variations are:

- Informants who are most highly involved, on both factor scales, are somewhat less likely than the rest to think of getting in touch first of all with any office or official, and rather more likely to answer in terms of an elected representative. This representative is predominantly a local councillor.
- The Interest in Local Affairs factor (though not Social Attachment) differentiates between informants who would consider going first of all to the *head* of the council department concerned with their complaint or enquiry. The highly involved informants on this scale claim to be more likely to do so.

In combining with the above figures responses as to an alternative contact which might be made, we tend to obscure some of these variations. The most interesting variations, between highly and lowly-involved informants are thus:

- The high-scoring group in terms of Social Attachment are less likely to contact the specific council department or its head as either a primary or secondary move:

TABLE 187

Social attachment, and hypothesised contact with council department

(Base)	Social attachment "Low" ↔ "High"	
	Groups 1-5 1969	Group 6 230
Council department	22%	15%
Head of council department	17	15

and more likely to mention an elected representative: a Member of Parliament or a local councillor:

TABLE 188

Social attachment, and hypothesised contact with an elected representative

(Base)	Social attachment "Low" ↔ "High"		
	Groups 1-4 1756	Group 5 213	Group 6 230
M.P.	25%	29%	32%
Local councillor	22	28	31

(While we present these figures for their interest in respect of the official/elected representative dichotomy to which we have referred earlier in this report, we would nevertheless note that the variations are quite small and only just reach a satisfactory level of statistical significance).

- High-scoring electors on the Interest factor-scale differ from the rest of the sample in their greater propensity to contact, primarily or secondarily,

any sort of elected councillor, *as well as* (slightly) the specific council department concerned, and more especially its head:

TABLE 189  
Interest in local affairs, and hypothesised contact

(Base)	Interest in local affairs "Low" ← "High"		
	Groups 1-4 1823	Group 5 186	Group 6 190
County, local or parish councillor	% 25	% 34	% 38
Council department	21	23	25
Head of council department	15	25	26

They are somewhat less likely to answer in vague terms, mentioning the "council" or the local town hall.

(e) *Experience of Accessibility.* The Social Attachment factor does not differentiate between informants in the extent to which they claim to have experienced in the past a need to resolve a complaint or enquiry, with the exception that the least involved group claims slightly more widely to have done so. The factor describing Interest in Local Affairs does, however, fairly clearly distinguish between informants in this respect:

TABLE 190  
Community involvement, and experience of making an enquiry/complaint

(Base)	Social attachment "Low" ← "High"						Interest in local affairs "Low" ← "High"					
	873	324	357	202	213	230	833	296	388	306	186	190
Have experience of making an enquiry or complaint	28%	21%	23%	21%	24%	22%	22%	21%	22%	29%	30%	36%

Bearing in mind the extremely small numbers involved we may note in passing that among the highly involved group (on the Interest scale) the most frequently-mentioned services about which a complaint or enquiry had been made were:

- Refuse collection and disposal, 6%,
- Health and drains, 6%,
- Highways, streets and roads 6%,
- Town Planning 5%, and
- Education and schools 5%

(f) *Knowledge of town hall and county hall location; and attitudes towards proximity.* Given that the level of correct awareness of the location of the local town hall or main council offices was high over the entire sample, it is not surprising that in statistical terms neither of these two factors of community involvement differentiates radically between informants in their ability to specify this location

correctly. In spite of this, there is evidence that more correct knowledge of the situation of the town hall is shown by high-involved informants on both scales. Such differentiation is not, however, confined solely to the highest-scoring group—as Table 191 illustrates:

TABLE 191  
Community involvement, and knowledge of the location of town hall  
and county hall

(Base)	Social attachment						Interest in local affairs					
	"Low"					"High"	"Low"					"High"
	873	324	357	202	213	230	833	296	388	306	186	190
Town hall location—correct answer given	83%	82%	85%	86%	89%	88%	82%	81%	83%	91%	90%	89%
Base: (all in M.B./U.D.'s and R.D.'s)	558	203	236	143	142	166	525	191	264	195	122	151
County hall location—correct answer given	54%	47%	48%	57%	54%	49%	43%	47%	51%	60%	57%	72%

Table 191 also shows that while Interest in Local Affairs is correlated with a greater knowledge of the correct location of the county hall (nearly three-quarters of those in the most highly involved category are able to specify where it is), the Social Attachment factor appears to have no bearing upon this index.

Analysis of attitudes towards the proximity in which informants would wish to have their respective town hall in relation to their home suggests that informants possessing a higher degree of involvement on the Interest factor scale are slightly more widely in favour of a *closer* location:

TABLE 192  
Community involvement, and opinion as to ideal distance of town hall/  
main council office

(Base)	Social attachment						Interest in local affairs					
	"Low"					"High"	"Low"					"High"
	873	324	357	202	213	230	833	296	388	306	186	190
Town hall should be:	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Fairly near	32	40	36	30	42	40	34	30	33	42	40	42
Further away	7	3	2	3	6	3	5	5	6	3	4	4
Don't care	56	51	56	61	44	51	53	57	57	52	53	50
Don't know/ Q.N.A.	6	6	5	6	8	6	8	8	4	3	3	4

(g) *Attitudes towards the size of local authority areas.* There is, firstly, some suggestion of an association between informants' degree of involvement on both scales and the extent to which they have formed positive opinions on the ideal size of their respective local authority area. Excluding those who replied "don't care" or "don't know", however, there is no variation of significance between the opinions of the highly- and lowly-involved in this respect.



TABLE 193  
Community involvement, and attitude towards optimum size of  
local authority area

(Base)	Social attachment						Interest in local affairs					
	"Low" ←					→ "High"	"Low" ←					→ "High"
	873	324	357	202	213	230	833	296	388	306	186	190
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Don't care about size of local authority area	14	11	10	12	9	6	14	14	12	6	7	7
Don't know/Q.N.A.	9	10	8	9	8	6	11	8	7	7	5	5
<i>Base: (all expressing an opinion)</i>	671	257	294	159	177	202	623	229	312	265	164	167
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<i>Local authority area should be:</i>												
Made bigger	22	24	23	21	26	23	22	23	23	24	23	26
Made smaller	6	7	5	3	6	6	6	6	3	8	5	5
Stay the same	72	69	73	76	68	70	72	71	73	68	71	70

(h) *Attitudes towards representation.* As in the above question, informants' ability to be able to specify an ideal area which their local councillor would represent tended to decline in relation to a lower degree of involvement. This was particularly true in respect of their involvement on the factor of Interest in Local Affairs (see Table 194). Once again, therefore, we have separately analysed the responses of those informants who were able to express an opinion on this question. This shows no consistent or significant variation according to Social Attachment. There is some marginal justification, however, for concluding that informants more highly involved on the Interest factor are in favour of a larger sized area of representation than those with lower scores on this scale. We should

TABLE 194  
Community involvement, and optimum size of area of representation

(Base)	Social attachment						Interest in local affairs					
	"Low" ←					→ "High"	"Low" ←					→ "High"
	873	324	357	202	213	230	833	296	388	306	186	190
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Don't know what size area councillor should represent	31	31	28	23	23	25	36	31	26	23	20	12
Q.N.A./other answers	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	1	4	2	2	5
<i>Base: (all expressing an opinion)</i>	579	218	251	151	157	169	518	202	273	229	145	158
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<i>Area of representation should be:</i>												
Smaller than present ward/parish size	40	41	33	47	41	40	44	41	41	35	38	30
Ward/parish equivalent	54	54	58	48	52	55	50	52	51	60	58	61
Larger than present ward/parish size	7	5	9	5	8	6	7	7	8	5	4	8

nevertheless note that the highest score category contains the largest proportion of informants who would prefer an area equivalent in size to the *present* unit of representation, a ward or parish.

Finally, we look at replies concerning the residence of the local councillor—whether informants consider he should live locally. Informants who were highly involved on the Interest factor more widely shared the opinion that he *should* do so:

TABLE 195  
Interest in local affairs, and attitude towards the location  
of councillor's residence

(Base)	Interest in local affairs "Low" ←————→ "High"		
	Groups 1-2 1129	Groups 3-5 880	Group 6 190
	%	%	%
Local councillor should live locally	59	68	80
Don't care	39	30	17

There was a much less consistent pattern of relationship with scores on the Social Attachment scale, though the largest proportion of informants in favour of local residence for their councillor was again found among the most highly-involved group.

## 2. Some conclusions from the enquiry

A great deal of statistical data is generated by a survey of this nature and size. The 195 tables shown in this report are but a fraction of the total series of analyses which have been carried out and communicated to the Royal Commission. They provide a bank of data which may be used for reference purposes. The commentary presented in this report has been fashioned generally along the lines of the four main themes of the enquiry, and has set out to investigate each in turn.

In this final section, we propose to take a still wider look at the data, and try to draw together some of the—perhaps quite separate—threads which may be seen running through the survey as a whole. In discussing the term "community", there have been two major aspects which have dominated our attention: the size of geographical area which best describes the physical extent of a person's community; and the social attributes, the activities and patterns of behaviour which are the crucial to the formation of a meaningful concept of "community". We have seen earlier in this latter section of the report how we have isolated two, quite distinct, types of community involvement. Both of these, nevertheless, are related statistically-speaking to two main expressions of *subjective* involvement on the part of the individual elector:

- he can conceive of an area to which he belongs, and where he feels "at home";
- and he would feel very sorry to leave the area.

Notwithstanding the cachets which we have given to these two factors of involvement, it is clear that one relates very largely to a fundamental state of life—it bears heavily upon the existence of circles of kinfolk, relations and friends—and the other implies a more active interest in the affairs of the community. Both, we



have seen, often differentiate quite visibly between the responses of electors in "high" and "low" categories to other questions about various aspects of use and knowledge of, and attitudes towards local government. It should also be noted, however, that with regard to some of these aspects, the degree of involvement is *not* significantly associated with a variation in response. In other words, involvement with the local community does not seem to be a relevant feature of any differences which might exist in these particular respects between sections of the electorate.

This conclusion is particularly true for the Social Attachment type of involvement. Bearing in mind its essentially passive or, we might even say, "introvert" nature, when compared with the variables which contribute to the Interest factor, this may not be thought surprising. Indeed, in a number of the instances where Social Attachment does discriminate between responses, we are inclined to attribute this discrimination to secondary features inherent in the membership profile of the high and low score categories. In particular, we are thinking here of the sex and education bias in this profile.

These observations relate less appropriately to the second factor, Interest in Local Affairs. However, since active interest and participation in local public affairs are among the main contributors to this factor, it may be thought surprising that at times an even stronger discriminatory ability is not shown. In many of the critical areas of interest on local government matters, we might conclude that other instruments of analysis—depending upon the subject area involved—show as evident, or more evident patterns of variation in response.

While the majority of electors appear to have a concept of an area to which they are prepared to consider an allegiance, most of them visualise it on quite a limited geographical scale: the equivalent of a small district or ward (or parish in rural areas), or very often smaller still—no more than a group of streets around their homes. Thus, an attempt to mirror the pattern of local communities in the structure of local government divisions appears on the face of it to imply the retention of some form of representation at least on a fairly local basis—perhaps one even more limited geographically than at present. Replies to our questions upon the optimum size of the area of representation, and on the residence of the local councillor seem to bear this out. However, we would note again that there is no absolutely conclusive evidence from this survey that electors *do* equate geographically their "home" community area with the area which they feel most suitably reflects their requirements with regard to representation at the local government level.

Is there any evidence to be derived from these data that electors who think of a "home" area of a larger (or smaller) size than average, themselves differ in other qualitative or behavioural respects? We think there is: those who have a wider conceptualisation of the area appear to score more highly on both of the factor-scales. Once again, we are left to query whether there is some inherent connection, or whether this is due to secondary factors. (For example, informants in the higher socio-economic groups both have larger "home" areas and score more highly on the Interest scale.)

Turning to possible behavioural differences, we encounter a basic paradox. A more widely conceptualised area by definition permits greater *opportunity* for the various forms of social activity to take place. Thus, it is hardly surprising—just to take one example—that some eight in ten of electors with a "home" area described as the size of a town or city (or larger) most often pursue at least one entertainment or leisure activity within that area, compared with only about three in ten of those who are thinking of an area the equivalent in size of a few groups of streets. More importantly, as we showed in Section B, the geographical distri-



bution of activities *clusters* in and around the elector's "home" area, so that the area nevertheless does appear to comprise a disproportionate number of them. In this sense, we would have no hesitation in concluding that the "home" area does represent a nucleus of people's activities. The extent to which it includes—geographically speaking—activities of different types is governed by other factors: commercial considerations, the need to permit optimum access to a wider area of population, the type of appeal which the particular activity makes, and so on. We have concluded, too, that in many instances certain forms of public entertainment and leisure activity do not (statistically) comprise part of community feelings. We have seen how "home" areas (in towns and cities) have for the most part been defined in such a way that they exclude the central areas in which these activities are located.

There are three breakdowns in particular which frequently serve to distinguish between sections of the total sample in their responses to our questions, and which contribute to an understanding of the data. The first of these is length of residence. This is especially strongly associated with various aspects of community life and activities, and indeed is one of the main indicators of involvement of the Social Attachment type. In particular there is often a very visible difference between the remainder of the sample and those electors who have lived in their "home" area for more than twenty years, many of them in fact having been born there. The importance of this factor, length of residence, lies partly in the fact that it allows for a wider opportunity to form social ties, experience social activities, and assume familiarity with the area in its several physical and personal respects. It also implies a deeper and more qualitative form of commitment to the area, though this may well be manifested in tangible forms (house-ownership, dependence upon business customers and contacts, or even a position of employment) as well as, for example, patterns of friendship among people in the area, or simply attachment in a vague form to the area as a whole.

Throughout the survey, one of the major breakdowns used has been by type and size of local authority area. It has been striking that in many areas of investigation, especially those dealing with qualitative aspects of community feeling, a quite recognisable variation in response is shown by electors living in the smaller urban authority areas, those with up to 30,000 population. To mention just a selection of the dimensions upon which this difference occurs:

- they are more likely than others to see their "home" area as comprising the whole of the local authority area;

- they are more likely to be "very sorry" to leave the area;

- they possess the largest average number of adult friends, and more frequently discriminate in fact between people in and outside their "home" area on the grounds of the greater friendliness of the former;

- as a reflection of these attributes, they therefore score slightly more highly on the Social Attachment factor scale.

Our conclusion would be that these are areas with an observably higher degree of social cohesion. To some extent, this may be explicable in terms purely of their smaller physical size and possibly the fact that they may often occupy a free-standing location.

A further factor to which we would draw attention is the apparent importance of the elector's level of education. This differentiates responses in a number of important question areas. Very often, variations recognisable in terms of this item, are visible too in a breakdown by socio-economic status. The two attributes are, of course, associated and it is a matter of judgement and finer interpretation to decide whether any causative influence is present in the determination of

particular responses; and if so, to which of these factors that influence may be attributed. Both are, of course, also associated with other indices crucial to the study of knowledge of and attitudes towards local government. Informants of higher social status and a higher level of education may be considered to be more "knowledgeable" in the wider sense, they are more closely peers of the managers, elected representatives and decision-makers in local government; they are more frequently involved, themselves, in community and local governmental affairs. They represent, more than their proportionate numbers would suggest, a larger part of the highly active, highly interested group in terms of involvement with the community. Their greater mobility, complementarily implying shorter and weaker ties of residence and relationship within the community means that they are much less involved in the manner which is characterised by the Social Attachment form of community feeling.

### Summary

1. Three factors were derived from the analysis, each describing different types of community involvement. These were:

- (i) "Social Attachment"—related to patterns of kinship, extended relationship and acquaintance in the "home" area.
- (ii) "Interest in Local Affairs"—concerned with variables measuring active interest in local government and local public service, interest in the events of the "home" area, and number of friends in the area.
- (iii) "Employment/Conviviality"—comprising two main variables only, employment in the "home" area and visiting a local public house in the area.

Further analyses were carried out using the first two of these factors only.

2. Relatively few informants were found to be highly involved on either scale. They number no more than approximately one in ten of the total sample.

3. The person who is most highly involved with his community area in a way described by the Social Attachment factor is more likely to be:

- male,
- very young, (i.e. 24-34),
- of a lower level of education,
- of a lower socio-economic status, and
- resident closer to the centre of the local authority area.

The highly-involved informant on the scale relating to Interest in Local Affairs is also more likely to be male, but otherwise—when compared with the profile of the entire sample—leans towards a different description:

- elderly,
- of a higher or secondary level of education,
- employed, either full- or part-time (rather than non-working), and
- of a higher socio-economic status.

4. The degree of involvement in terms of Interest in Local Affairs is higher among residents in rural districts, and markedly so in areas of greatest rurality (i.e. lowest density). The highest degree of Social Attachment is found among electors in the smallest urban authorities, those of less than 30,000 population.



5. In terms of certain key issues which were comprised within the survey, the main items upon which informants with a high degree of Social Attachment diverge from the remainder of the sample may be summarised as follows:

- (i) they conceptualise a "home" (community) area of a generally larger size;
- (ii) when considering whom they would contact in order to resolve enquiries or complaints over local government services, they are somewhat less likely to think of getting in touch with any office or official, and rather more likely to think in terms of an elected representative, especially (as a primary step) a local councillor.

6. Informants with a high degree of involvement on the factor termed Interest in Local Affairs, show expectedly a wider range of divergence from the rest of the sample, particularly in respect of their opinions on some issues relating to local government. The main items over which they show a different pattern of response are:

- (i) they too conceptualise a "home" area of a larger size;
- (ii) they possess a slightly greater knowledge of the responsibility for the provision of local public services;
- (iii) a larger proportion of them are able to mention local public services which are, in their opinion, quite well or not so well run;
- (iv) in considering whom they would contact in enquiries or complaints over local government services, they also are less inclined to contact bureaucratic sources, and more often consider getting in touch with elected representatives. If they mention the specific council department at all in this respect, they more often consider going straight to the head of that department;
- (v) they have more experience of having made enquiries or complaints over local services in the past;
- (vi) they have a wider correct knowledge of the location of their respective local authority town hall and, more especially, of that of their respective county hall;
- (vii) they are slightly more in favour than is the remainder of the sample of having the town hall fairly near to their home address;
- (viii) they are marginally more in favour of retaining an area of local government representation about the same size as that which exists at present (i.e. ward or parish equivalent). Sixty-one per cent of the most highly involved informants on this factor select this size.
- (ix) they are substantially of the opinion that their councillor should reside locally.



## APPENDIX A

### DEFINITIONS USED IN THIS REPORT

#### SIZE OF "HOME" AREA

	<i>Urban interviews</i>	<i>Rural interviews</i>
<i>"Extended"</i>	County/region Local authority area + surrounding area	County/region Local authority area + surrounding area Local authority area alone (i.e. R.D.) Part of local authority area, plus surrounding area Area between parish equivalent and local authority area
<i>Town/city equivalent</i>	Local authority area alone (i.e. C.B./M.B./U.D.) Part of local authority area, plus surrounding area	— —
<i>Ward equivalent or larger</i>	Area between ward equivalent and local authority area Ward equivalent	— —
<i>Part of ward</i>	Group of streets One street	— —
<i>Parish equivalent</i>	—	Parish equivalent
<i>Part of parish</i>	—	Part of parish
<i>Not answered at Q.3</i>	Don't know/Q.N.A.	Don't know/Q.N.A.

#### EDUCATION

<i>Higher:</i>	Full-time education past the secondary level (i.e. at technical college, teacher-training college or university).
<i>Secondary:</i>	Informants who finished their full-time education at state or private grammar-type schools, technical or commercial schools, or (in the case of older people) the old "central" or "intermediate" schools.
<i>Lower:</i>	Informants who finished their full-time education at secondary modern schools, the old "elementary" schools or other equivalent schools.

#### SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

This is a classification of the informant him or herself, not a grouping by the status of the head of household. Non-working housewives and retired people are classified according to last job held. Six categories are used in the analysis of the data from this survey. Together with a brief designation and the form of their

derivation from the Registrar General's socio-economic groups, these are as follows:

<i>Group</i>	<i>Designation</i>	<i>Derivation from R.G. socio-economic groups</i>
1	Large employers and professional workers	01 Employers and managers in large establishments; 03 Professional workers (self-employed); 04 Professional workers (employees).
2	Small employers and farmers	02 Employers and managers in small establishments; 13 Farmers (employers and managers); 14 Farmers (own-account workers).
3	Intermediate non-manual workers	05 Intermediate non-manual workers; 06 Junior non-manual workers; 07 Personal service workers; 12 Own-account workers (other than professional).
4	Skilled manual workers	08 Foremen and supervisors; 09 Skilled manual workers
5	Semi- and unskilled manual workers	10 Semi-skilled manual workers; 11 Unskilled manual workers; 15 Agricultural workers
	Never employed/others	16 Members of armed forces; 17 Too vague to code; 18 Never gainfully employed; Not answered

#### RESIDENCE

This categorisation refers to length of residence in the "home" area, and is based upon answers to Q.4a of the survey.

#### POPULATION STABILITY

This index is based, for individual wards and parishes within the sample, upon the net population change per annum between the census of April 1961 and that of April 1966.

#### POPULATION DENSITY

This index is based upon the number of persons per acre, as at the April 1966 census, within each individual ward or parish.

*Q.N.A.*

Question not answered

*D.K.*

Don't know

\* This symbol is used to represent percentage figures of less than 0.5%.

## APPENDIX B

### TECHNICAL DETAILS

#### 1. Sample Design

A three-stage sampling design was employed. At the *first stage* separate procedures were followed for the selection as sampling points of (i) municipal boroughs and urban districts, and (ii) county boroughs and rural districts.

- (i) All municipal boroughs and urban districts were listed within a three-fold stratification by population size (up to 30,000/30,000–60,000/60,000 and over), within a three-fold grouping of Registrar General's revised Standard Regions (North, North-West, Yorkshire and Humberside/East Midlands, West Midlands and South-West/East Anglia and South East excluding the Greater London Council area). Thirty-eight authorities were then selected with a probability proportionate to their population size. These are shown on the following page.

In addition, a supplementary sample of six municipal borough or urban district authorities of a 60,000–100,000 population was drawn.

- (ii) All county boroughs and rural districts were listed within the eight Registrar General's revised Standard Regions of England, excluding Greater London, and we selected—again with a probability proportionate to population size—thirty-three county boroughs and twenty-three rural districts. These are also shown overleaf.

At the *second stage*, from each of the 100 authority areas (including those in the supplementary sample of M.B.'s and U.D.'s), two wards or parishes were selected, again using the p.p.s. method.

At the *third stage*, an average of thirty local government electors was selected from each of the 100 authorities (i.e. fifteen from each ward or parish), using the Electoral Register as a sampling frame.



**Local authority areas included in the sample**

<i>Registrar General's revised standard region</i>	<i>County boroughs</i>	<i>Municipal boroughs</i>	<i>Urban districts</i>	<i>Rural districts</i>
<i>North</i>	Carlisle Middlesbrough Sunderland		Billingham Crook and Willington Newburn Washington	Aysgarth Belford
<i>North West</i>	Bolton Bootle Liverpool (3) Manchester (2) Oldham Wigan	Ashton under Lyne Lytham St. Anne's	Brierfield Cheadle and Gatley Huyton with Roby Kirkby*	Bucklow Northwich
<i>Yorkshire and Humberside</i>	Kingston upon Hull Huddersfield Leeds Sheffield (2) Wakefield	Cleethorpes Goole Ripon Scunthorpe*	Bingley Skelton and Brotton	Doncaster Hemsworth
<i>East Midlands</i>	Derby Leicester		Hinckley Hucknall Sutton in Ashfield	Chesterfield Northampton S.E. Derbyshire
<i>West Midlands</i>	Birmingham Coventry Solihull Stoke on Trent (2) Warley	Leamington Spa Newcastle under Lyme Nuneaton*	Kenilworth Ripley	Hereford Rugby
<i>South West</i>	Bristol Exeter	Cheltenham* Swindon	Camborne- Redruth Exmouth Frome	Cheltenham Plympton St. Mary Thornbury Wadebridge
<i>East Anglia</i>	Ipswich	Cambridge* Kings Lynn		Huntingdon Loddon
<i>South East (excluding Greater London)</i>	Bournemouth Luton Portsmouth Southampton	Bexhill Folkestone Newbury Saffron Walden Worthing	Brentwood Cheshunt Crawley* Egham Fareham Letchworth Seaford Tonbridge	Bedford Bradfield Dorking & Horley Luton Sheppey Winchester

\* These points comprise the supplementary sample of M.B.'s and U.D.'s with a population of 60,000-100,000.

## 2. Response Rate

The final response rate for the survey was 77.4%. A full analysis of response is shown below:

Total sample set (named individuals)	3030
Ineligible (resident in institutions)	3
	<hr/>
	3027 (100%)
Interviewed, but rejected at editing stage	16 (0.5%)
Refused due to:	
"Too busy"	68
Subject of other interview(s) recently	10
"Not interested in local government"	117
(Broke appointments after learning the subject of the survey)	52
	<hr/>
	247 (8.2%)
Non-contacts:	
After 4 or more calls	33
On vacation during survey period	24
Itinerant or special occupations	17
	<hr/>
	74 (2.4%)
Incapable of being interviewed:	
Deceased	35
Premises empty or demolished	28
Ill	48
Physically or mentally defective	47
Language difficulties	3
	<hr/>
	161 (5.3%)
Moved from address:	
Moved home	178
Resident at alternative address during period of survey	9
	<hr/>
	187 (6.1%)
	<hr/>
Total interviewed and used in analysis	2342 (77.4%)

### 3. Sample Composition

#### (A) Type of local authority

The table below compares the distribution of the sample within the three types of local authority with that of the local government electorate of England, excluding the Greater London area:

	<i>Local Government electorate (<sup>000</sup>) (England excl. G.L.C.)*</i>	<i>% of total electorate</i>	<i>No. of local authority areas in sample</i>	<i>No. of electors in sample</i>	<i>% of electors in sample</i>
County boroughs	8,736	35.5	33	751	34.2
Municipal boroughs, urban districts	9,940	40.5	38	910	41.4
Rural districts	5,934	24.2	23	538	24.5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>24,610</b>	<b>100†</b>	<b>94‡</b>	<b>2199‡</b>	<b>100†</b>

\* Source: Registrar General's Statistical Review for 1966, relating to the local government electorate as at October 1965.

† Figures add to slightly more than 100% due to rounding.

‡ Excluding supplementary sample.

The latest information available at the time of compiling this report is for a date approximately eighteen months prior to fieldwork for the survey. Comparing the achieved sample with this information suggests that there is a very slight under-representation of local government electors in county boroughs, and a correspondingly marginal over-representation of municipal borough and urban district electors.



(B) *Demographic variables*

The table below shows the distribution of electors within our sample by sex, age, socio-economic status, educational attainment and employment status. Data are presented separately for the natural and supplementary samples and, where possible, compared with figures for the general population:

(Base)	Natural sample 2199		Supplementary sample 143	General population	
	%		%	%	
Sex:					
Male	48		43	*	48
Female	52		57		52
Age:					
21-34	24		26	*	26
35-44	20		22		19
45-54	20		21		19
55-64	18		17		18
65+	17		13		18
Q.N.A.	1		1		—
Socio-economic status:					
Group 1	M. 8	F. 1	1	(Males)	7
2	12	4	6		8
3	18	51	39	†	21
4	36	8	23		33
5	25	24	24		25
Never employed/others	1	12	7		6
Education:					
Higher	6		6		
Secondary	20		21		
Lower	74		73		
Employment:					
Working more than 30 hours per week	52		51		
Working 30 hours or less per week	10		13		
Not working	38		36		

\* Source: Registrar General's Annual Estimates of Population, June 1967 (England and Wales).

† Source: U.K. Census 1961.

(C) *Additional analyses of sample composition*

Further analyses are shown in the table on page 174.

(C) Additional analyses of sample composition

All informants	Type of local authority (and size/stability)												
	C.B.				M.B./U.D.					R.D.			
	Total	Conurbation	250,000+	60,000-250,000	Total	Conurbation	60,000-100,000	30,000-60,000	Up to 30,000	Total	Nil change, or decrease	Up to 2% increase	Over 2% increase
Base:	751	294	206	251	910	113	235*	288	417	538	194	152	192
Socio-economic status:	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Group 1	3	2	5	4	5	6	3	6	4	4	3	5	6
2	6	4	8	6	7	4	8	8	6	11	12	10	11
3	30	27	31	32	37	35	40	43	32	40	35	40	45
4	27	27	26	28	21	24	23	17	23	15	15	18	13
5	28	31	28	24	22	25	20	21	24	23	29	20	18
Never employed/others	6	9	2	6	8	6	6	5	11	7	6	7	7
Age:													
21-34	21	21	20	23	24	32	23	24	24	26	23	24	31
35-44	21	21	25	18	20	19	23	23	18	19	23	18	17
45-54	21	24	17	21	20	17	20	20	21	20	21	19	19
55-64	19	16	19	21	18	17	20	17	17	17	17	19	16
65+	17	17	18	16	18	15	14	16	20	17	16	19	16
Q.N.A.	1	1	1	1	*	—	*	*	—	1	—	1	1
Sex:													
Male	50	49	47	52	48	56	46	45	47	46	49	45	43
Female	50	51	53	48	52	44	54	55	53	54	51	55	57

\* Including supplementary sample.

## APPENDIX C

### REPORT ON PRELIMINARY QUALITATIVE STUDIES

#### INTRODUCTION

While a number of the main topics for the national questionnaire were predetermined by policy and planning needs, an essential part of the questionnaire design stage was to examine, in a quite informal and open-ended way, what the ordinary citizen felt about his community. By selecting a few informants from a wide range—in terms of their age, social origins and types of community—we planned to ensure both that topics of concern to these individuals would be represented in the questionnaire; and that interpretations made of the resultant data would be able to take into account those feelings and attitudes that could not properly be included in the national questionnaire study.

#### METHOD

##### *Areas*

Informants were selected from four particular local authority areas. A study of census data and personal knowledge suggested that these areas were likely to represent four very different types of experience of community life:

<i>Area</i>	<i>Type</i>
Dudley, Staffs.	A county borough (including parts of Brierley Hill incorporated in April 1966). Parliamentary constituency. Industrial. Population of 61,600 on 4,066 acres. Only 5 miles from Stourbridge and 6 miles from Wolverhampton. Population increased by 8.5% over the 1961-66 period.
Poole, Dorset	A municipal borough. Diversifying industrial and residential. Population of 95,000 (third largest M.B. in England) on 15,641 acres. Adjacent to Bournemouth. 1966 population up 4% from 1961.
Washington, Durham	An urban district. New town. Population of 17,230 on 5,760 acres. Durham 6 miles. 1966 population increased 5% over the 1961 figure.
Wendover, Bucks.	Civil parish. Market town, just within London commuter-belt, under the Chilterns. 1961 population 6,510 over 4,594 acres. 5 miles from both Aylesbury and Tring, London 37 miles.

##### *Type of Interview*

In each area two types of interview were undertaken: individual interviews and group interviews. The advantage of individual interviews is that the informant (or sometimes a married couple of informants) can be questioned intensively. Group interviews have the advantage that the statements of one informant produce reactions from other informants (e.g. agreement, disagreement, support, hostility, comment, etc.) which qualify and enrich the information required.

##### *Type of Informant*

In each of the four areas the total number of informants numbered 32. Although the areas differed a great deal from each other, the types of informant



selected from each of the four areas were kept constant. For the individual interviews the selected informants were:

	<i>No. of informants</i>
Unmarried, early twenties, either working- or middle-class, either man or woman	2
Young couples, working-class, white-collar, middle-class	6
Middle-aged couples, working-class, white-collar and middle-class	6
Elderly people, working-class and middle-class, either man or woman	2
Total for each area	16

Two group interviews were conducted in each area. At the planning stage it was thought that the type of informants for the group interviews could be selected on the basis of the individual interviews so as to represent sections of the population who had some particular interest related to the community life at the moment or in the recent past (e.g. parents of school-children in an area where education had become an issue). We departed from this plan partly because there was a shortage of issues that could be related to particular types of informant, but also because it was felt that to major on particular community issues would tend to beg the questions we wanted to answer: what was the range of aspects of the lives and aspirations of private citizens which were related to community life and institutions? The informants for each of the two group interviews were therefore selected according to one main criterion—duration of stay in the local authority area, as an indication of experience or opportunity of contact with the local community.

In each area, therefore, one group consisted of newcomers—relative to the other group in that area. Each group was mixed in age, sex and social grade, although the majority were working class and middle-aged. There were eight informants in each group.

### **Interview Content**

While every effort was made—with more than a fair measure of success—to encourage informants to speak freely and fully, all interviews had a basic list of topics which were to be covered. These were:

#### *Subjective community consciousness*

What—in terms of persons, things or institutions—do informants feel close to and involved with, in their environment?

#### *Objective community consciousness*

What behaviour and transactions take place that (whether the informant is aware of this or not) are or could be affected by the proximity or distance of local government?

#### *Individual factors*

How do individuals come to find (or avoid finding) themselves members of a community. What different parts do individuals play and how is this related to different communities in their area? How important are personal factors?

## FINDINGS

### Qualifications

The findings below must be regarded as—at most—suggestive. Their main function was to contribute to the coverage of different topics in the national questionnaire and to the interpretation of results, and not to stand as substantive hypotheses. The size of the qualitative project provided too slender a base for this. For the same reason, no attempt is made to characterise the four areas individually. Thus some of these findings presented themselves more clearly in just one or some of the areas.

### Physical Boundaries

Informants felt that they lived in a region with a centre that was surrounded by irregularly shaped sub-regions. The sub-regions sometimes had sub-centres, but not always (e.g. housing estates). The centre of a region was located at the intersection of shopping streets, and 'bus services. The distinction between a centre and a sub-centre was that a *centre* would be certain to have several of the following: a railway station, a 'bus terminus, department store, Woolworth's or Marks & Spencer, a cinema (or former cinema), a landmark (e.g. monument, square, fountain, distinctive building, etc.); a sub-centre would be certain to have several of the following: newsagent, tobacconist, confectioner, 'bus stop, public house, grocer. The sub-centre would be more easily accessible than the centre. The centre would tend to be visited for a specific purpose; the sub-centre for a variety of purposes often tied into hierarchies:

"I wouldn't have gone (to sub-centre) for that, but I needed to get . . . anyway."

"I was going to . . . , so I thought I'd go past (sub-centre)."

The more expensive the item to be bought, the closer the shop will be thought to be to the centre rather than to the sub-centre. Similarly, a wider choice of items and goods is perceived to be available the nearer one progresses to the centre. Conversely, the more frequently the outlet has to be used—foodshops, hair-dressers, ironmongers—the closer they are to the sub-centres.

The amount of agreement on what was a local centre or a sub-centre had to do, firstly, with *frequency of current use*, or use in the past (e.g. women who had earlier worked in factories, shops or offices, would be influenced by their past experiences); and, secondly, with *ease of access to these centres*.

Ease of access in turn had to do not with absolute distance, but with the convenience of the distance. Sub-centres were physically nearer (to residential areas); but to some people the main centre was easily accessible because a convenient route was available. To others an "across-town" journey, or crossing a busy bridge, is involved in getting to the main centre. The latter group might then regard their sub-centre as their main centre.

In addition to sub-centres and main centres, there were important individual places, which tended to be outside informant's sub-regions: schools, church, police station, library, open spaces, relatives' residence, doctor, individual shops and showrooms (i.e. gas, electricity) where hire-purchase payments had to be made regularly. These were often situated outside both the informant's own sub-region and their sub-centres, and formed stands of their own in zones of undifferentiated lack of familiarity.

It seemed that newcomers build up their regions by becoming familiar with certain individual places which then extend into islands in an unknown zone.



Gradually, with use, the zone becomes differentiated from others, and a definite region with a centre emerges.

Conceptualisation of the area and its surroundings into a centre with sub-regions and sub-centres, arose from the quotation and discussion of actual places and routes which were frequented by informants.

*Sub-regions* seemed to be defined by a distance (walking distance) which included places that were passed or visited at least once a week; by a certain homogeneity in age or type of housing; and by the absence of a transecting major road. Informants generally used a parish name for this sub-region—without any awareness that it was a parish name. Often there was awareness that the sub-region they *wanted* to refer to included half-a-dozen residential streets and the sub-centre. In attempting to define this sub-region and assign a name to it, they generally excluded about two-thirds of the similar residential streets which were also served by the same sub-centre. The name of the sub-region was then qualified, like Upper, Northern, This-side, etc.

Shopping, the need for personal services, and maintenance for house and car seem to be the main ways in which the feeling of the existence of a region is built up. Facilities for social contact (e.g. public house, cinema, dances, clubs, church), school and the workplace, are also important, but less so. The workplace is perhaps least important, because there seems to be little attachment to the location of the workplace or to the workplace itself, although ease of getting there is of course important, as are working conditions and, particularly, the people with whom one is in contact.

Both men and women claimed that they tried to spend as little time as possible at their place of work. For example, if there was time during the dinner break to move around the vicinity of the workplace, the time was considered better spent going home for dinner, or shortening dinner time in order to get home earlier.

### **Importance of Home**

All this suggests that the area of greatest concern to informants was based on home life and the things connected with home life. The implicit reason supporting this was very simple: the home was the repository of the family's total capital and emotional investment. This implied reasoning may be overtaken by developments, however, and it is indulged in less by younger people.

### **Developments**

The developments are the use of the motor car (people see themselves as more willing to use it and less conscious of running costs; they are using more reliable cars; they are taking their wives and families with them more for longer distances—and of course more people regard a car as a necessity); and the development of new shopping centres and leisure facilities outside the informants' own regions.

There is the implication therefore that for the present, a person's area is based on the immediate vicinity of his home; but that informants are becoming—very slightly—aware of the pull of islands outside what they would regard as their own sub-region. The implication is that a person's sense of a home-based region is determined by the prevailing (or possibly, already outdated) distribution of outlets, services and travel modes (i.e. walking); and that, if these were different, so would be his perception of his area or region.

### **Administrative Regions**

From the point of view of government and administration, the perception informants have of their region does not appear to be *conditioned* by parish or



ward boundaries even though their definition of the region may coincide approximately with these. There is, however, considerable awareness of borough boundaries (partly because of the Rate which often differs), and parliamentary constituency boundaries. This awareness arises from the publicity surrounding elections, particularly posters. Election material (e.g. the colour and typography of posters rather than content) would not differentiate between wards, but it would differentiate between boroughs and parliamentary constituencies.

### Problems in the Locality

A problem with a specifically local site (e.g. a crossing, lamp standards, derelict cars, etc.) would be seen as settled smoothly through a council official—rather than a local councillor representing a ward—or, if without success, through the local member of parliament at Westminster—rather than his ward or constituency party organisation. A local councillor or the local M.P.'s committee rooms would be contacted if the problem was personal and complicated (e.g. landlord-tenant relations; pension claims, etc.).

There is the implication here that the more personal the problem, the more specific and detailed it is, the greater is the need for face-to-face discussion with someone capable of understanding and sharing the viewpoint of the person seeking advice. The more the problem is one of the area, "of the streets", the more it is shared by people (e.g. local residents, parents, etc.), the less do the people involved want detailed advice. Someone with a detailed knowledge might merely complicate matters by not wholeheartedly endorsing the demands that were being made. When the problem is a public one in the area, what seems to be wanted is the *support* of a power figure responsible to the particular set of people who feel they have a problem or grievance, to set against other powers (e.g. administrators) who are insusceptible to pressures from what are sectional interests.

These sectional interests might be thought to represent the community sense of individuals (e.g. tenants, parents, etc.) in relation to regions wider than those to which these individuals feel they belong when these interests are not aroused. Whether or not there is a community sense which is *not* based on the home area or region seemed to depend on the nature of the problem. Selection at 11-plus at the local school united parents with others living in a very indistinct, and not home-based area (i.e. the L.E.A. area). The traffic outside the local school, however, was seen to involve only the parents in, at most, a number of adjacent regions. The nature of the political pressure that these parents would mobilise, however, would be determined by the almost standard nature of the problem and not by its local nature; and by the need to bring pressure to bear rather than to examine the problem in depth or to allow issues to be raised (e.g. traffic jams) that would complicate the problem and delay what appears to the local pressure group to be a simple solution which they have already solved satisfactorily themselves at a theoretical level. What they want is pressure, against prevailing priorities and towards implementation of their own solutions.

This distinction in the nature of the relationships that are sought with power figures—problem-solving as distinct from pressure—suggests in passing that one might, by survey research methods, identify not only geographical or administrative areas, but areas of concern. Informants could then be asked (in effect) in what way they felt concerned: as parents, as tenants, as housewives; or as "ordinary" individuals (i.e. citizens). They could then be asked the type of action they would expect a specified list of, for example, councillors, M.P.'s, political parties and administrators to be involved in. Of course the list would also have to include a number of what appeared to be key occupations or institutions outside

the formal system. Informants mentioned milkmen, the local shopkeeper, police, minister of religion, local organisations and local newspapers, as being involved at different stages of recognising, formulating, publicising and resolving local problems.

### Interest in Community

What makes some people more interested in the community (whether it is based on a home region or on common interest) than others?

In general terms, this interest has to do with commitments that could be affected by change. The various commitments we came across readily fell into three groups. Financial and economic commitment (e.g. owner-occupiers, work and working conditions, shopkeepers, etc.) are fundamental. Secondly, personal commitments, where the well-being of another person reflects back directly on an individual. Such people would be family members, especially the helpless (e.g. the aged and children) and people who had a general tendency to feel responsible for others (e.g. people interested in Oxfam, socially and politically orientated people). Thirdly, there were people who were "structurally" committed, that is, their commitment was not to money or to people, but to the structural fabric of their region; this broke down into the convenience effects of structures (e.g. the width of pavements or streets, parking facilities); and aesthetics (e.g. the style of housing, the condition of gardens). We found it impossible to decide whether these were specific interests (i.e. a person with one interest would be no more likely to have one of the others, than a person without any), or whether they were more general (i.e. the structural interest went with one other of the remaining interests).

At any rate, simple relationships, like duration of stay, did not in themselves appear connected with one or other sort of interest in community. Duration of stay with children at school, or with owner-occupation, on the other hand might be expected to be related to interest in the community, as would the *intention* to stay for a long time.\*

The number, quality and variety of discretionary contacts (as distinct from unavoidable ones) were very significant for involvement in the community. As was the case with problems in the locality, the *nature* of contact would determine whether the involvement would be with the community in the home-based region, or with groups in and out of the region with whom there was a community of interest. The ratepayers' association, a Christmas club, or a mail order commitment to a canvasser, would tend to be a regional commitment. Supporting the local football team, the theatre or participating in a sweepstake at work, might be an involvement with a community that was not located in the home-based region.

We have here used only some of the examples that informants mentioned. Most examples of contact needed discussion and definition before one could decide on their consequences for the types of community and the way people would feel differently about these types. This makes a detailed exploration by questionnaire methods impossible without involving the use of a major part of the questionnaire.

### Reorganisation of Areas

The aspect of contact which has special interest to the survey was the size and format of government units. Would people feel that greater size would have the

\* The national survey itself, and the factor analysis in particular, tended to *support* the idea that length of residence in the "home" area was a strong indicator of involvement, and therefore interest in the community based upon that area. Although no question on intention as to future residence was included in the questionnaire, an approximately similar one—on the degree of pleasure/sorrow which the informant might experience in moving away from the area—has also been shown to bear a high correlation with the various indices of involvement.



potential advantages of economies of scale, better use of scarce talent, possibility of greater investments, better communication between fewer large-scale units, and so on? Would they alternatively feel that an increase in size implied many negatives?

The first point to report here is that, although most of our informants were not aware of any experience of this sort of change (the exception was that, deliberately, about half the Dudley informants had been selected from Brierley Hill), they produced a negative reaction to it, when it was suggested and however it was suggested (i.e. whether or not size was stressed in the suggestion).

It was always possible to pick a point when the informant (in the individual interview) or the group as a whole began to express criticism of local government services, controls, expenditure, planning, representatives, correspondence, etc. Discussion of local government in the abstract was extremely limited. The danger to which informants were most immediately alert was that of the great distance—or rather, the greater distance—between themselves and their administrators or representatives that would be introduced by possible structural change in local government. Informants could in fact see advantages in the delays and confusions in the present state of affairs, which they were unwilling to see in the notion of greater size or greater integration.

The cause of this bias towards the *status quo* is the quoted richness of unpleasant personal experience of innovation and change in the interests of efficiency. The main sources of this experience are the work setting and shopping. The mass media are believed to provide a daily diet of support of this experience and informants will readily quote fiction and fact in support of their personal experiences.

Apart from a generally negative attitude towards a rationalised increase in the scale of local government, there are two main points that, to informants, make local government specifically unsuited to any increase in size and in integration

The first is that the present unit of local government is seen as being immense. This perception seemed to be due to the fact that the comparison being made was that between the individual and the local authority; or between a one-man business and the local authority. The second point that makes any increase in the size and integration of the local authority a negative idea is the ubiquity of the local authority. Informants genuinely fear that chaos—greater chaos, they would say—will result, simply because of the complexity of authority responsibilities. The implication here is that the advantages of integration are not accepted or understood. More speculatively, the conclusion was reached that sometimes the citizen does not really want local government that is too efficient. He fears that this might alter the balance unfavourably between himself and authority.



## APPENDIX D

### SOME NOTES ON PROCEDURE IN THE FACTOR ANALYSIS

*At the first stage*, twenty-five variables derived from the questionnaire were isolated, all of them *prima facie* related to aspects of community life. These may be divided into two categories:

(i) "Direct" or subjective indicators. These were three in number and were taken from questions of an attitudinal nature:

Q.2 (Whether or not the informant can conceptualise a "home" area to which he belongs);

Q.10 (How sorry or pleased the informant would be to leave the "home" area); and

Q.8 (How interested the informant is to know what goes on in the "home" area);

(ii) "Indirect" or behavioural indicators:

Q.4a (Length of residence in "home" area);

Q.9 (Number of local newspapers read regularly);

Q.11 (How many people informant knows in "home" area);

Q.12a (How many adult relatives and in-laws living within ten minutes' walk from informant's home);

Q.12b (How many adult friends living within ten minutes' walk);

Q.13a (Proportion of all of informant's relatives and in-laws who live in "home" area);

Q.13b (Frequency of seeing relatives);

Q.14a (Proportion of all of informant's friends who live in "home" area);

Q.14b (Frequency of seeing friends);

Q.15a/c (Employment in "home" area);

Q.16a/c (Amount of leisure time spent in "home" area);

Q.17 (Number of clubs and organisations belonged to);

Q.18 a/c (Attendance at place of worship in "home" area);

Q.19a, b, e (Visiting a "local" public house in "home" area);

Q.20a/d (Children at school in "home" area);

Q.21a, b (Frequency of driving outside "home" area);

Q.22 (Access to a telephone in the home);

Q.23a/c (Undertaking a weekly shopping "expedition" in the "home" area);

Q.24 (Number of entertainments most often visited in the "home" area);

Q.32 (Active interest in the running of local government);

Q.33a, b (Participation in local public service);

Q.37 (Payment of local rates).

In order to avoid the (otherwise interesting) possibility of evolving factors from this set of variables which—though highly significant—were not necessarily related to community involvement, some procedure was required so as to guarantee that the results would remain relevant in this respect. As a first stage, therefore, to analysis of the whole set of data, coefficients of correlation were produced for the three direct questions, on judgement the best indicators available for this exercise. The matrix of correlation for this trio was as follows:

	Q.2	Q.8	Q.10
Q.2	1.0000		
Q.8	0.1800	1.0000	
Q.10	0.4166	0.2617	1.0000

This showed that Questions 2 and 10 were more highly inter-correlated than Question 8 was with either of them. Study of the contingency tables from which these coefficients were derived also tended to confirm that Question 8 was a somewhat less efficient “discriminator” in terms of responses to other questions, and suggested therefore that it may be measuring something more specific than a general attitude towards the “home” area. This was confirmed later by the factor analysis itself. Questions 2 and 10 were thus proceeded with, *prima facie*, as the best general indicators of community involvement.

As a second stage, cross analysis of the variables against Questions 2 and 10 was carried out in order to:

establish the most appropriate dichotomised form for each. (A complete matrix of correlation coefficients obtained for each pair of variables from the twenty-five, showed an apparently low level of correlation. Study of the contingency tables from which the matrix of coefficients was derived showed that in many cases it was the extreme response or responses which showed a significant level of discriminatory ability);

reduce the number of variables to be included in the factor analysis by omitting those with little (or inconsistent) discriminatory ability.

The variables which were then comprised within the factor analysis were (apart from Questions 2 and 10):

Questions 4a, 8, 9, 11, 12a, 12b, 13a, 14b, 15a/c, 16a/c, 18a/c, 19a/b/e, 24, 32, 33a/b.

The table on page 184 shows the correlation matrix for these questions which we then proceeded to factor analyse.

The third stage constituted the factor analysis proper employing the above variables. The method of extraction of factors used in this analysis was the principal component method, a procedure which allows for the maximum variation of the variables.

Three factors were initially identified. These were then rotated by the varimax criterion so as to concentrate the loadings of the original variables. This highlights the association between the factors and the original attributes. The three factors evolved and the variables with the greatest loadings on each were:

Factor 1	Variable	Loading
Q.13a	(Proportion of relatives living in “home” area)	0.727
Q.12a	(Number of adult relatives living within ten minutes’ walk)	0.661
Q.14a	(Proportion of friends living in “home” area)	0.609

[illegible]



Factor 1—cont.

	Variable	Loading
Q.4a	(Length of residence)	0.583
Q.11	(Number of people known in "home" area)	0.504
Q.12b	(Number of friends living within ten minutes' walk)	0.419

This was the strongest of the three factors; it accounted for 25.43% of the total variance. We termed this a factor of "*Social Attachment*".

Factor 2

	Variable	Loading
Q.32	(Active interest in running local government)	0.617
Q.8	(Interest in what goes on in "home" area)	0.611
Q.33a, b	(Participation in local public service)	0.480
Q.11	(Number of people known in "home" area)	0.400

We termed this factor "*Interest in Public Affairs*". It accounts for a further 16.41% of the total variance.

Factor 3

	Variable	Loading
Q.15a/c	(Employment in "home" area)	0.741
Q.19a/b/e	(Visiting a local public house in "home" area)	0.665

This factor is difficult to explain as an aspect of community involvement. It comprises only the two variables of employment and drinking in a "local", and may well be a function of a completely separate variable such as socio-economic status. It accounts for only an additional 0.01% of the total variance. We termed this factor "*Employment/Conviviality*".

At the fourth stage, having identified three factors, we wished to refer these back to our best available general indicators of involvement, Questions 2 and 10, so as to confirm that the factors were related to these. A multiple regression analysis was therefore carried out, producing the following matrix of correlation coefficients:

	Q.2	Q.10
Factor 1	0.2614	0.2408
Factor 2	0.1409	0.1378
Factor 3	0.0443	0.0441

In fact, all three factors made a statistically significant contribution to explaining Questions 2 and 10 scores, but Factor 3 was only just significant. From this matrix we can derive the standardised equation for each variable:

$$Q.2 = 0.77061 + 0.12056 F_1 + 0.06499 F_2$$

$$Q.10 = 0.40410 + 0.12806 F_1 + 0.07328 F_2$$

Thus, Factor 1 (*Social Attachment*) is about twice as important as Factor 2 (*Interest in Local Affairs*) and the two variables, Questions 2 and 10, have very similar equations, except for the constant term. By comparison with these two main factors, Factor 3 (*Employment/Conviviality*) is of little significance.

Finally, as a fifth stage to the exercise, informants were individually categorised on scales for each of Factors 1 and 2, in order to allow for cross-analysis with other data from the survey. The distribution of scores upon each factor has been shown earlier in this section of the report.

# ROYAL COMMISSION ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN ENGLAND

## OTHER PUBLICATIONS

### RESEARCH STUDIES

1. Local Government in South East England, by the Greater London Group. Price 40s. (41s. 5d.).
2. The Lessons of the London Government Reforms, by the Greater London Group. Price 7s. 9d. (8s. 6d.).
3. Economies of Scale in Local Government Services, by the Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of York. Price 4s. 9d. (5s. 3d.).
4. Performance and Size of Local Education Authorities, by the Local Government Operational Research Unit. Price 15s. (15s. 8d.).
5. Local Authority Services and the Characteristics of Administrative Areas, by the Government Social Survey. Price 4s. 3d. (4s. 8d.).
6. School Management and Government, by the Institute of Education, University of London. Price 11s. (11s. 7d.).
7. Aspects of Administration in a Large Local Authority, by the Institute of Local Government Studies, University of Birmingham. Price 17s. 6d. (18s. 8d.).
8. The Inner London Education Authority—A Study of Divisional Administration, by Anthea Tinker. Price 7s. 6d. (8s.).

### WRITTEN EVIDENCE

- Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. Price 5s. (5s. 5d.).  
Department of Economic Affairs. Price 2s. (2s. 3d.).  
Department of Education and Science. Price 5s. (5s. 6d.).  
Ministry of Health. Price 3s. 6d. (3s. 11d.).  
Home Office. Price 5s. (5s. 5d.).  
Ministry of Housing and Local Government. Price 7s. 6d. (8s.).  
Ministry of Labour. Price 3s. (3s. 3d.).  
Board of Trade. Price 2s. 6d. (2s. 9d.).  
Ministry of Transport. Price 3s. 6d. (3s. 11d.).  
H.M. Treasury. Price 1s. 9d. (2s.).
- |  |   |                         |
|--|---|-------------------------|
| County Councils Association  | } | Price 21s. (21s. 10d.). |
| Association of Municipal Corporations                                      |   |                         |
| National Association of Parish Councils                                    |   |                         |
| Rural District Councils Association  |   |                         |
| Urban District Councils Association  |   |                         |
| County Borough Councils. Price 13s. (13s. 9d.).                            |   |                         |
| County Councils. Price 32s. 6d. (34s.).                                    |   |                         |
| Non-County Borough Councils. Price 32s. 6d. (34s.).                        |   |                         |
| Rural District Councils. Price 47s. 6d. (49s. 3d.).                        |   |                         |
| Urban District Councils. Price 60s. (64s. 6d.).                            |   |                         |
| Parish Councils. Price 38s. (39s. 8d.).                                    |   |                         |
| Professional Organisations. 32s. 6d. (34s. 1d.).                           |   |                         |
| Commercial, Industrial and Political Organisations. Price 20s. (21s. 2d.). |   |                         |

### MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

- Day 1 Department of Economic Affairs. Price 3s. 6d. (3s. 9d.).  
Day 2 Ministry of Health. Price 3s. 6d. (3s. 9d.).  
Day 3 Home Office. Price 3s. (3s. 3d.).  
Day 4 Ministry of Transport. Price 3s. 6d. (3s. 9d.).

- Day 5 Department of Education and Science. Price 4s. 6d. (4s. 11d.).  
Day 6 National Association of Parish Councils. Price 3s. 6d. (3s. 9d.).  
Day 7 Ministry of Housing and Local Government. Price 4s. (4s. 3d.).  
Day 8 Rural District Councils Association. Price 4s. 6d. (4s. 11d.).  
Day 9 National and Local Government Officers Association. Price 3s. 6d. (3s. 9d.).  
Day 10 Urban District Councils Association. Price 4s. (4s. 3d.).  
Day 11 Association of Education Committees. Price 4s. (4s. 3d.).  
Day 12 Association of Municipal Corporations. Price 5s. (5s. 3d.).  
Day 13 County Councils Association. Price 4s. 6d. (4s. 11d.).



© *Crown copyright* 1969

Published by  
HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE

To be purchased from  
49 High Holborn, London W.C.1  
13A Castle Street, Edinburgh 2  
109 St. Mary Street, Cardiff CF1 1JW  
Brazennose Street, Manchester M60 8AS  
50 Fairfax Street, Bristol BS1 3DE  
258 Broad Street, Birmingham 1  
7 Linenhall Street, Belfast BT2 8AY  
or through any bookseller